UNIVERSITÉ DE STRASBOURG

The Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem

Its purpose in the light of the Synoptic Gospels

Thèse présentée à la Faculté de Théologie protestante pour obtenir le grade de docteur d'Université
Et soutenue publiquement le 10 juillet 1923

PAR

WILLIAM HEALEY CADMAN

B.Litt. (Oxon.), B.D. (Lond.)
D.Theol. (Strasbourg)

Lecturer in the Faculty of Theology, University of Oxford
Tutor in New Testament Greek, Mansfield College, Oxford

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
1923

The Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem

Oxford University Press
London *Edinburgh* *Glasgow* *Copenhagen*
New York *Toronto* *Melbourne* *Cape Town*
Bombay *Calcutta* *Madras* *Shanghai*
Humphrey Milford Publisher to the UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITÉ DE STRASBOURG

The Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem

Its purpose in the light of the Synoptic Gospels

Thèse présentée à la Faculté de Théologie protestante pour obtenir le grade de docteur d'Université
Et soutenue publiquement le 10 juillet 1923

PAR

WILLIAM HEALEY CADMAN

B.Litt. (Oxon.), B.D. (Lond.)
D.Theol. (Strasbourg)

Lecturer in the Faculty of Theology, University of Oxford
Tutor in New Testament Greek, Mansfield College, Oxford

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
1923

UNIVERSITÉ DE STRASBOURG.

FACULTÉ DE THÉOLOGIE PROTESTANTE

Examinateurs de la soutenance :

M. G. BALDENSPERGER, président de la soutenance.

MM. G. BALDENSPERGER
J. MONNIER
E. MÉNÉGOZ
} Examinateurs.

No. 5

Printed in England

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The problem stated. The importance of the crisis in Galilee. Critical presuppositions. Pp. 9–10.

CHAPTER I

THE CRISIS IN GALILEE

I. *Jesus and the religious officials in Galilee.*

The material to be examined. Teaching in the Capernaum Synagogue. Forgiveness of sins. Eating and drinking with publicans and sinners. Fasting. The old garment and the old wine-skins. The ears of corn. Healing on the Sabbath. Combination of Pharisees and Herodians against Jesus. Clean and unclean. Summary. Pp. 11–26.

II. *Jesus and Herod Antipas.*

The material to be examined. Herod's personal attention given to Jesus. Reasons for Herod's hostility. Luke xiii. 31–3 should be assigned to Galilee. Arguments for this view. The significance of the pericope and its bearing on the crisis in Galilee. The theory that Jesus withdrew from Galilee owing to the intervention of Herod examined from the point of view of the Marcan account of the close of the Galilean ministry. The Marcan report largely unhistorical. Concluding observations, and remarks on the account of the Feeding. Pp. 27–46.

III. *Jesus and the Galileans.*

The theory that Jesus left Galilee partly owing to a loss of popular support not established by Synoptic evidence. The material in John vi. 15 and 66 is without significance for the Galilean crisis. Albert Schweitzer's explanation of the departure of Jesus from Galilee. The unsatisfactory critical basis of the theory. The bearing of the crisis in Galilee on the purpose of Jesus in going to Jerusalem. Pp. 46–56.

CHAPTER II

THE CONFESSION SCENE

The importance of the period of the wanderings outside Galilee. The Marcan account of the Confession scene. The historical value of the Marcan material considered, first of all, in the light of the Matthaean and Lucan parallels, and then of Q, and finally of its intrinsic and general historical probability. Examination of the grouping of material judged to be trustworthy. The historical significance of the Confession scene: the popular opinions about Jesus—the declaration of Peter—the order of silence—the announcement of the Passion and of the Parousia—Jesus and the rôle of the Son of Man—the second Peter scene—the demand of martyrdom from the intimate disciples and its bearing on the purpose of Jesus in Jerusalem. Pp. 57–101.

CHAPTER III

ON THE WAY TO JERUSALEM

The limits of the discussion. The broad features of the material. The commencement of the journey. The avoidance of publicity in Galilee. The explanation of the secrecy. Reasons for ignoring, for the most part, the travel-narrative of Luke (ix. 51–xviii. 14). Discussion of Luke xii. 49 f. ('I came to cast fire . . .'). The promise to the disciples (Mark x. 29 f.) of earthly rewards in the present age is either unhistorical or post-dated. The prediction of the Passion and Resurrection in Mark x. 33 f.—in its present form a *post-eventum* editing. The λύτρον-passage (see also pp. 152–3). The Bartimaeus episode does not imply that Jesus regarded Himself as 'the Son of David' and openly accepted the title. Summary. Pp. 102–13.

CHAPTER IV

THE FINAL APPEAL

The pericopes to be discussed. The entry into Jerusalem. Reasons for rejecting the Messianic interpretation. The purification of the temple. Jesus's motive. The desire of the hierarchy to destroy

Jesus. Suggested explanation of their temporary powerlessness. The question about authority. The parable of the husbandmen and the heir is unhistorical in its present form, and ought not to be applied to the problem of the purpose of Jesus in Jerusalem. The tribute money. The question about the Messiah. Jesus was correcting a common opinion about the rôle of the Messiah. The anointing at Bethany. Rejection of the theories that Jesus was anointed for Messiahship. The betrayal by Judas. The problems raised. What did Judas betray? The theory that Judas made known to the hierarchy secret information about Jesus and the Messiahship examined in the light of the legal proceedings. Judas informed the Jewish authorities that Jesus had identified Himself with the apocalyptic 'Son of Man'. The reason for the disloyalty of Judas. The bearing of the betrayal on the work which had drawn Jesus to Jerusalem. Concerning the last thoughts of Jesus about His mission. Did He re-affirm His mission on yet another plane after He became aware of the betrayal? Consideration of the accounts of the Last Supper. What meaning did the rite have for Jesus Himself? Originally no reference to the 'many', but only to the disciples who partook of the meal. Reasons for thinking that Jesus did not declare that He was about to die for the sake of the intimate disciples. Elimination of secondary features. The Western account in Luke xxii. 15–19a. The trustworthiness of the mention of covenant-blood. The purpose of Jesus: to make a covenant with the disciples through a sacramental rite. The command to repeat the rite. Questions affecting a decision as to whether Jesus made a fresh affirmation of His mission just before the end of His life: Jesus's knowledge of the betrayal at the Last Supper—Gethsemane and the cry from the cross—the flight of the disciples—Jesus and the rôle of the Suffering Servant of Jahweh. General summary of conclusions. Pp. 114–59.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41548028_0010

INTRODUCTION

§ 1

It is recognized by New Testament critics that the Synoptic accounts of our Lord's last journey to Jerusalem raise problems the answers to which are not immediately obvious. The fundamental question is this: What aims did our Lord desire to realize in the city? In other words, what was His conception of His mission in the latter part of His life? Did He go to Jerusalem expecting to die? Or is the Synoptic representation that He did so a projection into the sources? If He did not expect to die, how ought the object of the journey to be understood? On the other hand, if He believed that death awaited Him in Jerusalem, in what way did He connect His coming death with His mission? Inseparable from the general problem is this further question: In what sense, if in any, did He associate the journey with the exercise of the functions of the Messiah? On each of these matters critical opinion is notoriously at variance.

Our Lord's purpose in making the journey to the city cannot be understood merely with the aid of the material which the Synoptic editors have assigned to the Jerusalem period. For the journey was primarily the result of a momentous crisis which arose in Galilee. I intend to consider first of all what that crisis was and what formative influence it exercised on our Lord's view of His mission.

The Galilean crisis was due historically to the opposition which our Lord encountered from the religious authorities and from Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea. I shall therefore endeavour to draw out the significance and the consequences of the crisis by an examination of (*a*) the Synoptic stories of the conflicts between our Lord and the

religious officials in Galilee, and of (*b*) the attitude of Herod Antipas. There is one other aspect of this preliminary inquiry which will require notice. I refer to the view (*c*) that our Lord's Galilean followers played a part in bringing about this first great crisis in His public ministry. Loss of popular support (it used to be thought), as well as antagonism from official quarters, induced Him to leave Galilee. Recently Dr. Albert Schweitzer has advanced a new theory about the rôle of the Galileans ; I shall take it into account in the proper place (see pp. 50–2).

§ 2

I mention here, without paying attention to details, the critical presuppositions with which I approach the evidence : (1) the authors of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke made extensive but independent use either of our Gospel of Mark, or of a document very similar to it ; (2) they also had before them another written document, i. e. Q, consisting almost entirely, if not exclusively, of our Lord's sayings, and containing the material which they report in common, and possibly also a few passages which only one or other of them reports ; and (3) in addition to Mark and Q, Luke drew on an old and valuable source. I adopt the view of the majority of scholars that Q was compiled before the Gospel of Mark ; also their assumption that the testimony of Q is, broadly speaking, trustworthy. It would be useless to attempt to make a pronouncement in a sentence or two on the value of the other sources, considered as embodiments of the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord ; my views about the genuineness or otherwise of passages relevant to the present problem will be given as occasion arises.

I

THE CRISIS IN GALILEE

I. Jesus and the religious officials in Galilee

Outline of the material to be examined: (1) teaching in the Capernaum synagogue (Mark i. 21–8, Matt. vii. 28, 29, Luke iv. 31–7); (2) forgiveness of sins (Mark ii. 1–12, Matt. ix. 1–8, Luke v. 17–26); (3) eating and drinking with publicans and sinners (Mark ii. 13–17, Matt. ix. 9–13, Luke v. 27–32); (4) fasting (Mark ii. 18–22, Matt. ix. 14–17, Luke v. 33–9); (5) the figures of the old garment and the old wine-skins (Mark ii. 21–2, Matt. ix. 16–17, Luke v. 36–9); (6) the ears of corn (Mark ii. 23–8, Matt. xii. 1–8, Luke vi. 1–5); (7) healing on the Sabbath day (Mark iii. 1–6, Matt. xii. 9–14, Luke vi. 6–11); (8) clean and unclean (Mark vii. 1–23, Matt. xv. 1–20; cf. Luke xi. 37 ff. = Matt. xxiii. 25 f.). (9) The passage in Matthew v. 17–19 (footnote, p. 26).

§ 1. *Teaching in the Capernaum Synagogue*

(Mark i. 21–8, Matt. vii. 28–9, Luke iv. 31–7)

Our Lord's independent attitude towards 'the tradition of the elders'. In this story a germ of the later conflict between our Lord and the orthodox religious leaders can be discerned. It is reported in Mark (similarly in Matthew) that our Lord's hearers were astounded because He was teaching ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς. The Lucan variant (ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ) is probably unimportant. The normal custom of a Galilean scribe in expounding the Torah was to make an appeal to the authority of older accredited teachers.[1] From the present story it appears that our Lord Himself taught without reliance on these sources of authority. Accordingly here in this narrative are the beginnings of His unfavourable attitude towards the παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων. Later on His

[1] Quite possibly there was a Shammaite school in Galilee 'which taught with close reference to particular rules and views with which Jesus had little in common' (Dr. I. Abrahams, *Pharisaism and the Gospels*, pp. 13 ff.).

protest received a more definite formulation, and became the main line of cleavage between Himself and the religious leaders.

§ 2. *Forgiveness of Sins*

(Mark ii. 1–12, Matt. ix. 1–8, Luke v. 17–26)

The setting and relevancy of the story. In Mark the incident is staged in Capernaum.[1] Probably the Matthaean editor meant the same thing by the phrase *τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν*. Luke's fifth chapter implies a Galilean setting for the controversy. After He had terminated the ministry in Galilee, our Lord did not return to that country again, except secretly (see Mark ix. 30). There is therefore good reason to believe that the present controversy is not only Galilean, but also occurred early enough to be relevant to the Galilean crisis.

The historical basis of the narrative. In its present form the story is intended to prove that our Lord possessed authority to exercise the divine prerogative of forgiving sins. But the trustworthiness of that representation is doubtful.[2] The pivot of the story is Mark ii. 7 (*τί οὗτος οὕτως λαλεῖ; βλασφημεῖ· τίς δύναται ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός;*)—a verse which is unsatisfactory from the critical point of view. For the scribes themselves do not actually say to what they object in our Lord's conduct;[3]

[1] Spitta thinks that this controversy and those which follow it occurred in Judaea. His reasons are that Luke is here based on the apostolic 'Grundschrift', that the better attested reading 'Judaea' in Luke iv. 44 should be adopted, and that 'Judaea' is to be understood in the narrower sense as opposed to Galilee or Samaria. See *Streitfragen der Geschichte Jesu*, pp. 14 ff.; *Die synoptische Grundschrift*, pp. 66 ff. Spitta's theory is too complicated for discussion here.

[2] It has been suggested that the whole of Mark ii. 5b–10 should be removed on the ground that it is a piece of Church polemic against the Synagogue. See Loisy, *Les Évangiles synoptiques*, i, pp. 88, 107, 476; also Bacon, *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, p. 24. This proposal seems to me to be arbitrary.

[3] Note the expression *διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν*. The Lucan parallel (*ἤρξαντο διαλογίζεσθαι*) might seem to suggest that the thoughts were

later Christian tradition (it seems to me) is their spokesman. If verse 7 has undergone modification, it is no longer likely that the historic event concerned the possession by our Lord of an authority proper only to God in Jewish thought.[1]

The probable root of the dissension: forgiveness can be found without taking up 'the yoke of the Torah'. Notwithstanding the uncertainty about the original form of Mark ii. 7, it is obvious that the scribes must have regarded with extreme disapproval the assurance of forgiveness which our Lord is said to have given to the paralytic (Mark ii. 5 *ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι*). And yet there can be no doubt that both our[2] Lord and His opponents[3] believed that God forgives human beings who have repented. What then was the reason for the hostility? The secondary features of the story compel us to fall back on general considerations. And amongst these the most important seems to be this: Pharisees would have held that a truly repentant man would become loyal to the Torah both in its written parts and in its oral developments.[4] Our Lord, on the other hand (as we shall see later on), did not endorse the Pharisees' views about the Torah. For Him repentance implied allegiance, not to the Torah as understood by the Pharisees, but, in effect, to the prophetic type of morality. By some means or other He was aware that the paralytic in the story had repented; hence the words *ἀφίενταί*

uttered aloud; but v. 22 b presupposes the contrary (*τί διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν;*). See also Mark ii. 8 (= Matt. ix. 4).

[1] It should be observed that the unhistorical colouring in ii. 7 necessarily appears again in ii. 10, which is designed to refute the charge in ii. 7. For 'the Son of Man' question, see the short discussion on pp. 92 ff.

[2] Cf. Mark i. 15, Luke xv. 11–32 ('Prodigal Son'), xviii. 9–14 ('Pharisee and Publican'), xv. 3–7 = Matt. xviii. 12–13 ('Lost Sheep'), xv. 8–10 ('Lost Piece of Silver'), &c.

[3] See, for example, the passages from Rabbinical works cited by Herford, *Pharisaism*, pp. 211–15.

[4] For Pharisees the oral tradition was no less 'Torah' than the written law; both were supposed to be divine in origin and therefore perfect and binding in all their particulars. See 'Abôth iii. 11; Sanhedrîn xi. 3; also Schürer, *Geschichte J. V.*, vol. ii, p. 390.

σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι. It is quite likely that the man was a despised *am ha-areṣ*; if so, strict Jews would have regarded him as disqualified for entry into the Kingdom[1] of God. That was quite contrary to our Lord's own conviction. A man who had repented, and therefore had been forgiven, would enjoy the blessings of the Kingdom.

I conclude that the challenging demeanour of the scribes ought probably to be explained thus: it was apparent to them that the Torah, on which Pharisaic Judaism rested, was being set aside.

§ 3. *Eating and Drinking with Publicans and Sinners*

(Mark ii. 13–17, Matt. ix. 9–13, Luke v. 27–32)

The Synoptics are in close agreement about the essential features of the story; doubtless what they report is trustworthy.[2]

It is probable that the connexion between the present incident and the call of Levi (Mark ii. 14) is topical, not chronological. But an early date in the Galilean ministry seems to be indicated by two considerations: (*a*) the inclusion of the τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοί within the scope of our Lord's mission was no late development; and (*b*) it is improbable that the Pharisees would have long delayed their protest.

At bottom the question in dispute was the fate of the 'amē ha-areṣ' (*'the people of the land'*). The τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοί belonged to the *amē ha-areṣ*. This expression was the reproachful designation of all who were ignorant of the Torah, or indifferent to its observance.[3] Our Lord summoned the

[1] Cf. Schürer, *G. J. V.*, vol. ii, pp. 402, 419 ff.

[2] Q witnesses to our Lord's custom of consorting with τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοί (Matt. xi. 19, Luke vii. 34); similarly the special Lucan material (xv. 1 ff., xix. 1–10, &c.).

[3] See Prof. G. E. Moore's valuable discussion of the *amē ha-areṣ* in

amē ha-areṣ to repentance, the necessary condition of entry into the approaching Kingdom. I have already remarked that strict Jews in practice reserved the privilege of life in the Kingdom for those who accepted 'the yoke of the Torah'. Accordingly the Pharisees would have considered that our Lord's mission might become a serious menace to the Torah and the religion founded upon it.

§ 4. *Fasting*

(Mark ii. 18–22, Matt. ix. 14–17, Luke v. 33–9)

The Marcan editor relates that the Baptist's disciples and the Pharisees were fasting and that people[1] came (*καὶ ἔρχονται*) to inquire why our Lord's disciples abstained from fasting. He replied, in effect: it would be as unnatural for His disciples to fast whilst He was in their midst as it would be for wedding-guests to do so whilst the bridegroom was with them. However, later on the bridegroom[2] would be taken away and then the disciples would fast.

The present context of the story. In the dark foreboding of personal peril ('the taking away of the bridegroom') some critics have found an indication that the episode is considerably antedated in the tradition. The saying is understood to be an allusion to the Passion in Jerusalem. But no other prediction of the *via dolorosa* is made before the Confession-scene (Mark viii. 27 ff.), and, as a matter of history, only then did our Lord begin to speak of the fate which would be His in the city. Thus it is suggested that the incident would not have occurred until the latter part of our Lord's life. That, however, is probably an unnecessary view. A much earlier

Beginnings of Christianity, i, pp. 439–45 (edited by Foakes Jackson and Lake).

[1] In Matthew the Baptist's disciples are made to ask the question.

[2] Probably the Marcan editor understood the expression *ὁ νυμφίος* in v. 19 as a Messianic self-designation, but it is quite unlikely that our Lord Himself used it in that sense.

anticipation of a violent removal would be quite well accounted for, if our Lord had begun to recognize that Herod Antipas might interfere with Him as he had done with John the Baptist (cf. Mark vi. 17 f.). In that case, it need not be supposed that the historic context is seriously disturbed in Mark. I make these remarks in order to show that the incident is not without significance for the crisis in Galilee.

Why our Lord's disciples do not fast. It is well known that the story, in its present form, lies open to objection from more than one point of view. I refrain from a discussion of the critical difficulties[1] out of regard for the main aim of this chapter; and in any case the broad significance of the incident is clear: our Lord Himself attached little or no religious value to fasting, whereas the Pharisaic Rabbis and the followers of the Baptist considered it to be an indication of piety and an aid thereto. Fasting had become a marked feature of Pharisaic and other circles in our Lord's day.[2] It might be either public and prescribed or private and voluntary, and was practised with a variety of particular ends in view. If neglect of some individual fast led to the present inquiry, the sources do not enable us to know what it was. But possibly our Lord's defence of the disciples throws some light on the matter. It seems that the reason why they refrained from the fast was to be found in His presence and ministry. J. Weiss has suggested that there may have been an eschatological reference in the fast: the coming of the Kingdom of God might be hastened by contrition (*Die Schriften des N. T.*, p. 84). That surmise would suit the explanation of the disciples' abstinence, and if it be adopted it could be urged that our Lord would have meant: the Kingdom is not far away; indeed, it is 'at hand'; but its actual appearance is dependent, not on anything which human beings can do, but

[1] For a notice of these see, for example, Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, vol. i, pp. 88–9.

[2] See Schürer, *G. J. V.*, vol. ii, pp. 489 ff.; Oesterley and Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, p. 432 f.

on the purpose and power of God.[1] Whether that be a true explanation or not, the story in the Gospels reveals another line of demarcation between our Lord and the Pharisees.

§ 5. *The Old Garment and the Old Wine-skins*

(Mark ii. 21–2, Matt. ix. 16–17, Luke v. 36–9)

The movement of repentance which our Lord was spreading required new 'forms' in which to maintain and express itself. There seems to be no good reason why these adages should not be authentic; but to what period of the ministry they originally belonged, and what the circumstances of the moment were, can no longer be ascertained.

The usual opinion that the 'old garment' and the 'old wine-skins' represent the orthodox Judaism of our Lord's time is probably[2] right. In that case, our Lord would have meant that it was not the purpose of His mission to inform Pharisaic Judaism with a new spirit and power. His was a new movement, and an attempt to force it into the framework of the old would have dire consequences for both. Wellhausen[3] thinks that the remarkable radicalism of these utterances was not applied in practice. But our Lord's attitude to 'the people of the land' (*amē ha-areṣ*) does not bear out that opinion.

§ 6. *The Ears of Corn*

(Mark ii. 23–8, Matt. xii. 1–8, Luke vi. 1–5)

The variations in the reports of the incident. Matthew and Luke depart from Mark in several particulars. Thus Matthew brings out the points that the disciples were hungry[4] and ate the corn, and Luke that they rubbed[5] the ears in their hands.

[1] See the remarks about this matter on pp. 137–9.
[2] For a different view see J. Weiss, *Die Schriften des N. T.*, vol. i, p. 96.
[3] *Das Evangelium Marci*, p. 19.
[4] Matt. xii. 1.
[5] Luke vi. 1.

Both omit the ambiguous ὁδὸν ποιεῖν[1] (Mark ii. 23). These variations from Mark correct the impression that the disciples cleared a path for Jesus through the crops (ἤρξαντο ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχυας);[2] they explain more clearly the parallelism between the disciples' action and that of David; and above all they indicate in what way the Rabbinic rulings about the Sabbath had been infringed. Matthew and Luke also omit the saying[3] τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο, κτλ., and the mention of Abiathar.[4] Further, in verses 5–7 Matthew gives a defensive *a fortiori* argument, the source of which cannot be known with certainty.[5] Except in the case of these Matthaean verses, Mark seems to have been the primary authority.

The controversy belongs to the Galilean period. The corn would have been ripe for harvest, since the disciples ate it. Hence the controversy occurred a little later than Easter,[6] and so a little less than a year before the Crucifixion.[7] At that time the Galilean ministry was still going on.

The controversy concerned the sanctity of the Sabbath. It

[1] 'Οδὸν ποιεῖν ('to make a road') seems to be wrongly used for ὁδὸν ποιεῖσθαι ('to journey'). Cf. Luke xiii. 22, Eph. i. 16.

[2] Mark ii. 23.

[3] The saying seems to have been added to Mark after Matthew and Luke had used that Gospel. See Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, vol. ii, pp. 142–3. It can be paralleled from Rabbinic sources. See 'Yômā', 85 b.

[4] The correction may be due to the desire, entertained independently by Matthew and Luke, not to perpetuate a slip for Ahimelech (cf. 1 Sam. xxi, and Swete's note, *Gospel according to S. Mark*, p. 48).

[5] The source may have been Q. See Sir J. Hawkins, *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 134.

[6] I am indebted to the late Prof. G. Buchanan Gray for the following note: 'Not only bread made from the new crops, but the grain, simply roasted or raw, was taboo till the sheaf was offered; and we may infer that the incident in the Gospels fell after Passover, or the disciples would have laid themselves open to a double charge of violation of the law, of which the Pharisees would scarcely have failed to avail themselves.'

[7] I share the view that our Lord's ministry lasted one year and a few months.

would appear from the codes which embody Rabbinic rulings about the kind of work forbidden on the Sabbath that the illegality of the disciples' conduct consisted in the 'plucking' and the 'rubbing' of the ears of corn. These actions would have come under the heads of 'reaping' and 'threshing', which were included in the thirty-nine categories of work not permissible on the Sabbath.[1] These categories were scribal elaborations designed to cover particular cases which were not directly contemplated by the Pentateuchal prohibition of work on the Sabbath. But from the point of view of the Pharisees they were none the less a part of the Torah on that account. In this affair in the cornfields our Lord's independent attitude towards the *παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων* again found expression. In his defence of the disciples, Jesus, it is said, cited the case of David: if the disciples' conduct was culpable, so was that of David when he ate *τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως*. From what follows it appears that Jesus meant that neither ought to be censured; for 'man[2] was not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath for man; hence man[3] was lord of the Sabbath'. That is the Marcan form of the defensive argument. The Matthaean editor, however, seems to have thought that the argument in that form was not as cogent as it might be (or possibly as it originally had been). Hence he has adduced an *a fortiori* argument based on the Old Testament. It takes the following shape: the Sanctuary takes precedence of the Sabbath (verse 5); but the principle of *ἔλεος*[4] takes precedence of the Sanctuary (verses 6 and 7); *a fortiori* the principle of *ἔλεος* takes precedence of the

[1] See Schürer, *G. J. V.*, vol. ii, pp. 470 ff. (Eng. trans., div. ii, vol. ii, pp. 97 ff.).

[2] If Mark ii. 28 be a relatively late addition, it is not necessarily on that account unauthentic.

[3] I regard *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in this instance as a mistranslation of the Aramaic expression *bār-nāšā* = 'man'. See the discussion on pp. 92–100.

[4] It should be observed that verse 6 is simply the introduction to the quotation from Hosea; hence it is the principle of *ἔλεος* which is referred to in the phrase *τοῦ ἱεροῦ μείζων ἐστιν ὧδε*.

Sabbath. Thus the disciples' action was covered and sanctioned by the principle of ἔλεος, the claims of which over Sanctuary and Sabbath were established by the 'law' (e.g. Num. xxviii. 9 f., Lev. xxiv. 8) and the prophets (Hosea vi. 6). Whether or not this Matthaean argument originated with our Lord Himself cannot be decided with certainty on critical grounds; but it is in line with His attitude towards the Torah as disclosed in other controversies.

Summary. The essential point arising out of the reports of this controversy is this: whereas the Rabbis allowed that the Sabbath laws should be relaxed when life was in danger,[1] Jesus subordinated the Sabbath to considerations of humanity in a much more marked degree. He taught, in effect, that the principle underlying the institution of the Sabbath was not invaded when the disciples (who are not said to have been in danger of starvation) took steps to satisfy their hunger which infringed the scribal rulings about the Sabbath. In other words, Jesus challenged, at any rate by implication, the authority of the Torah as understood by His opponents.

§ 7. *Healing on the Sabbath Day. The Pharisees and the Herodians combine and plot against the life of Jesus.*

(Mark iii. 1–6, Matt. xii. 9–14, Luke vi. 6–11)

The reports of the episode. The Matthaean version rests not only on Mark, but apparently also on Q, the Q material being verses 11–12 (= Luke xiv. 5). It may be that verse 12 was not in Q (it is absent from Luke), and that the Matthaean editor himself made the *a fortiori* argument of verse 11 more obvious by adding verse 12. Luke does not seem to relate

[1] The views of our Lord's opponents would have been in accord with the maxim, 'Preservation of life takes precedence of the Sabbath' ('Yômā,' 85 a). See the discussion by Dr. I. Abrahams, *Pharisaism and the Gospels*, pp. 132 ff.

anything which he could not have drawn from Mark. The Marcan report itself shows signs of re-editing. Thus the absence of the phrase *μετὰ τῶν Ἡρῳδιανῶν* from Matthew and Luke suggests that it was inserted in Mark after the other Synoptists had made use of that source.[1] That may perhaps be regarded as a hint that at first the Pharisees plotted only amongst themselves and formed the alliance with the Herodians[2] a little later on. Whether that be so or not, the fact that there was a pact with the Herodians is attested by subsequent events and by the circumstance that our Lord belonged to Herod's jurisdiction. A reference should also be made to verse 4.[3] Probably it does not go back to Jesus Himself in its present form, for it does not do justice to the rulings of the Rabbis about medical aid on the Sabbath.[4] It is significant that the Matthaean editor, who shows himself in this and in the preceding controversy to be familiar with Jewish procedure in argument, omits the verse.

When the incident occurred. The reports do not enable us to date the controversy with precision. But the fact that our Lord's opponents appear as men seeking a reason for accusing Him probably indicates that the charge of collusion with Beelzebul had not yet been made, for on that occasion representative Jewish officials finally repudiated Him. I cannot

[1] See Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, vol. ii, p. 210.

[2] As Foakes Jackson and Lake say, 'probability and the form of the word in Latin suggests that they (i. e. the Herodians) were the partisans of Herod' (*Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 119). Prof. F. C. Burkitt thinks that they were 'persons connected in one way or another with the government administration' (*The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 90). It is doubtful, however, whether this restriction of the reference is justified.

[3] *Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν ἀγαθοποιῆσαι ἢ κακοποιῆσαι, ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀποκτεῖναι : οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων.*

[4] I have already remarked (p. 20) that the Rabbis allowed that the Sabbath should be set aside when life was in danger, but not otherwise. See Luke xiii. 14 (cf. John ix. 16). It is worthy of notice that both Matthew and Luke bring Jesus somewhat nearer to the position of the Rabbis than Mark does—Luke by his mention of the *right* hand, and Matthew by the argument from the *one* sheep.

see any good reason for doubting that the episode belongs to the Galilean period.

The significance of the dispute. The incident illustrates the same conviction as that which our Lord asserted in His defence of the disciples in the cornfield: acts of mercy do not invade the Sabbatical[1] rest nor subvert the divine purpose expressed therein. These two controversies about the Sabbath mark a very important point of departure from Judaism as established on the Torah. It must have appeared to the opponents of Jesus that His mission was a menace to the religion of the Torah, and in that they were right. That the tension between Jesus and the official religious world in Galilee became much more acute owing to these Sabbath controversies is in every way likely.

§ 8. *Clean and Unclean*

(Mark vii. 1–23; Matt. xv. 1–20 [cf. Luke xi. 37 ff. = Matt. xxiii. 25 ff.])

In its present context the story falls too late. The position which this controversy now occupies in Mark is not likely to be historical. It is said that our Lord's questioners included 'some of the scribes who came from Jerusalem'.[2] We hear of them again in iii. 22, where they charge Him with being in league with Beelzebul. In vii. 1–23 they seem to be concerned to know how our Lord stands in relation to the Torah, and we get the impression that they have not yet made up their minds about Him. As the declaration that He is an agent of Beelzebul implies open and irreconcilable antagonism, it seems clear that the incident of vii. 1–23

[1] For a discussion about the sanctity of the Sabbath in Judaism, see Schürer, div. ii, vol. ii, pp. 106 ff.

[2] I accept the usual view that these scribes were a deputation of experts in the Torah sent to Galilee by the Sanhedrin. It would have been their task to determine, in an authoritative manner, whether our Lord's mission was dangerous to the religion of the Torah, and, if so, to take steps to suppress it. I think that the combination of the Pharisees and the Herodians against Jesus may very well have been a result of the investigations.

preceded it. But what place did the Beelzebul controversy itself occupy in the actual course of events? To some extent the matter is uncertain. At this stage I am obliged to assume one or two conclusions for which I shall give the reasons later on. In Luke the Beelzebul controversy occurs at xi. 14 ff., in the so-called 'Reisebericht' (ix. 51–xviii. 14). The arrangement of material as a whole in that section of Luke's Gospel is certainly not chronological. But Luke connects the Beelzebul controversy with the demand for a sign from heaven. And it has been suggested[1] that this conjunction of the two incidents may well be historical, but that the right place for both is at Mark vii. 11–13. That view seems to me to lack probability. At vii. 11–13 Jesus is in Galilee, but against His wish. He had already brought the Galilean ministry to a close at the Feeding of the[2] people (Mark vi. 34 ff.). It is not very likely that He would have joined issue with His critics about the authority of His mission after He had already attempted to depart finally from Galilee. It is probably true to say that their repudiation of Him on the monstrous charge led on to the Galilean crisis. In that case the Beelzebul controversy occurred before the Feeding of the people; and accordingly Mark vii. 1–23 was earlier still.

I have made these remarks in order to correct wrong views about the development of the opposition to our Lord's ministry in Galilee.

Jesus rejected the Jewish distinction between clean and unclean. Mark reports that our Lord was asked why His disciples neglected the custom of handwashing before meals. He is said to have rebuked His critics by applying to them an Isaianic passage and charging them with 'neglecting the commandment of God and holding fast to the tradition of men' (v. 8). He then gave reasons for His accusation. He

[1] See Prof. C. H. Dodd, *Expositor*, October 1921, pp. 273 ff.

[2] See pp. 44–6.

cited (it is said) two passages from the Pentateuch[1] (one from the Decalogue itself), and contended that these were violated by the oral tradition about vows. That conviction was illustrated by the famous Corban saying. I cannot here enter into a full discussion of the utterance. It must suffice to say that our Lord appears to have been arraigning the jurists for bringing within the scope of the Pentateuchal general teaching about vows (cf. Deut. xxiii. 21 f.) particular vows which were wrong in themselves. In explaining His attitude, He mentioned the case of a man who renders his property unavailable for his parents in their need. The man does this either by dedicating the property to the temple, or (more probably) by merely using the oath and formula of 'Corban'.[2] Apparently he vows his property away in a fit of anger. Subsequently he wishes to revoke the vow. The jurists do not permit him to do so. In the result, the fifth commandment is infringed. That is wrong, and the framers of the oral tradition and its supporters are blameworthy. Thus Jesus defended[3] His disciples in the matter of hand-washing by discrediting the oral tradition, of which the custom was a feature.

The rest of the story is still more significant. It is said

[1] Exod. xx. 12, xi. 17, cf. Lev. xx. 9, Deut. xxvii. 16. Matthew has made the argument more satisfactory by transporting Mark's Pentateuchal and Isaianic passages.

[2] So the Sinaitic Syriac. See Prof. McNeile, *St. Matthew*, p. 224; also Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Marci*, p. 54. The Marcan and Matthaean editors took the other view.

[3] The argument had been adversely criticized. It is pointed out from the Mishnah (cf. *Nĕdārīm*, viii. 1) that the Rabbis allowed that vows should be annulled when parents would suffer from them (see Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, i, pp. 164 ff.; Herford, *Pharisaism*, pp. 156 ff.). It is, however, as Prof. A. H. McNeile argues (*St. Matthew*, pp. 224 ff.), precarious to assume that on this matter the Mishnah represents the prevailing opinion in our Lord's day. There has already been occasion to remark that the Matthaean editor shows good acquaintance with the decisions of the Rabbis. It seems unlikely that he would have endorsed so glaring an error as the above critics find in the story.

that our Lord went to the root of the dispute by challenging[1] the truth of the principle on which the Jewish dietary laws were based. The principle was this: certain outward material things are capable in themselves of making a man religiously unclean. In opposition to this widespread idea of the ancient world, our Lord taught that only within the sphere of thought and moral action could a man incur religious defilement.

I conclude that the scribes must have regarded the teaching embodied in the story as subversive of the Torah. It traversed not only the oral tradition, but the Mosaic law itself.[2]

We need not now discuss any farther our Lord's relations with the religious officials in Galilee.

§ 9. *A General Summary of Results*

Our Lord came to Galilee to announce the approach of the Kingdom of God and to call His countrymen there to μετάνοια in preparation for it (Mark i. 15). That was the central thing in His mission. In pursuing His purpose He incurred the bitter hostility of the guardians of orthodoxy (Pharisaism), for they perceived that His mission was a menace to Judaism as founded on the Torah. They decided to adopt repressive measures, and resorted to plottings with the Herodians. It is not difficult to understand why the conflict arose. Pharisaic Judaism was built up on the belief that the Torah (i. e. both the oral and the written law) was permanently binding in all its particulars. And those who accepted the 'yoke of the Torah' were the true people of God. The various controversies in Galilee disclose the fact that Jesus Himself did not

[1] Οὐδέν ἐστιν ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτὸν ὃ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινῶσαι· ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενά ἐστιν τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον (Mark vii. 15). By adding εἰς τὸ στόμα Matthew interprets and gives a somewhat more restricted reference to the Marcan saying. But the latter may doubtless be regarded as authentic in substance.

[2] See Lev. xi, xiii–xv.

endorse those convictions. His attitude towards the oral tradition as a whole seems to have been unfavourable; some of its developments He quite definitely repudiated. He even superseded the pronouncements of the Mosaic law itself about cleanness and uncleanness. This remarkable radicalism[1] as regards the Torah expressed one side of our Lord's notion of μετάνοια and, from the point of view of the Pharisees, it was in that fact that the seriousness of the situation lay. The Rabbis would not have shut out any man from the Kingdom of God who had repented, but they could not dissociate μετάνοια from the knowledge and the practice of the Torah. Jesus, on the other hand, summoned 'people of the land' (*amē ha-areṣ*) to the Kingdom, notwithstanding their neglect of the Torah. He was able to do so because, as regards His conception of μετάνοια, He was in the line of the great prophets of Israel. The main reasons for the opposition of the religious authorities in Galilee are, put briefly, these two: (1) the predominant type of religion (Pharisaism) in our Lord's day was legalistic; (2) our Lord was sure to obtain (and He did obtain) a strong popular following, for the Kingdom of God was always an object of passionate longing to a Jew.

[1] I cannot doubt that Matt. v. 18–19 (so also Matt. xxiii. 2, 3) misrepresents our Lord's mind. These verses make Him declare that the Mosaic Law is eternally valid and binding in all its details. Notwithstanding the fact that verse 18 (cf. Luke xvi. 17) is attested by Q, the passage only reflects the outlook of the Jewish Christian body in the early Church. But, with the exception of the phrase ἢ τοὺς προφήτας (for the secondary character of which see McNeile, *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, p. 58; Allen, *Gospel according to Saint Matthew*, p. 46), the preceding verse may well be authentic. In that case, πληρῶσαι would mean, 'to develop the inward significance of some of the Mosaic enactments and to supersede others.'

II. Jesus and Herod Antipas

In this section of the chapter I propose to consider what Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea, had to do with the crisis in our Lord's Galilean ministry.

The material to be examined: (1) Mark vi. 14–16 (Matt. xiv. 1–2, Luke ix. 7–9). (2) Luke xiii. 31–3. This passage is of the utmost importance. (3) Luke xxiii. 6–16 (noticed in a footnote on p. 29).

Herod Antipas gives his personal attention to our Lord's work in Galilee. It would appear that the serious attention of Antipas himself was first directed to our Lord whilst the mission of the Twelve was in progress. According to the Marcan report (vi. 14–16), which is followed by Matthew (xiv. 1–2), Antipas expressed the opinion at this time that our Lord was the risen John. According to Luke, however, whose account is to be preferred to the Marcan (since he undoubtedly possessed superior knowledge[1] of Antipas and of his attitude to our Lord), the tetrarch was in no such superstitious ignorance as that; he knew that John was dead and had no longer to be reckoned with (ix. 9). Moreover, if we rightly trust the Lucan pericope, it was not, as in Mark (and Matthew), the 'miracles' of our Lord which had roused Herod's interest; he was concerned about τὰ γινόμενα πάντα (v. 7). This phrase must allude, in the first instance, to the activity of the Twelve on their mission, but it may very well refer, in a general sort of way, to the whole of our Lord's work in Galilee. Thus it can be understood why the tetrarch ἐζήτει ἰδεῖν αὐτόν (v. 9). What lay behind this desire to see Jesus? It is doubtless true that this Herod-pericope alone does not afford a satisfactory basis for the theory that Jesus had roused the hostility of Herod. But it is necessary to interpret

[1] The ultimate source of Luke's special information may have been Manaen, the foster-brother of Herod (Acts xiii. 1), or Joanna, wife of Herod's steward (Luke viii. 3, xxiv. 10). See *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 231.

it in the light of Luke xiii. 31–3, and of certain general considerations. Let us therefore go farther afield, beginning with arguments of a general character.

Herod's treatment of John the Baptist suggests that he would also have been hostile to our Lord. It is legitimate, first of all, to make an inference from the fate which the Baptist had met with at Herod's hands, and it points only one way. According to Josephus's [1] account of the reason for John's imprisonment, 'Herod dreaded his great persuasiveness with men, lest it should lead to a revolt of some sort, for they seemed ready to do anything that he advised' (*Antiq.* xviii. 5. 2). This is to be explained from the fact that John had been above all else a preacher of Messianism (Mark i. 7–8, Matt. iii. 1 ff., Luke iii. 3 ff.), a herald of a new order of things which in some sense would stand over against the old. He had not been, it would appear, an openly avowed political revolutionary; on the contrary, his aims and objects had been religious, and if also political, then only indirectly and by consequence. This notwithstanding, Herod did not permit John to keep his hold on the people. Probably it would be right to suppose that the tetrarch's fear of the Baptist was due to this: he knew that the popular religious and political [2] hopes were so closely intertwined that a rebellion against his semi-heathen régime was by no means impossible. It would be strange if Herod had not been stirred to antagonism by the work of Jesus. For after the voice of the Baptist had been silenced, another of a substantially similar kind was heard in the land, and the eschatological enthusiasm, with its attendant dangers, increased in volume.

[1] The passage from Josephus should be regarded as supplementary to the reports in the Gospels, or to such parts as may be judged to be historical. See Schürer, *G. J. V.*, vol. i, pp. 436 ff. (Eng. trans., div. i, vol. ii, pp. 23 ff.).

[2] On the question of the political element in Messianic hopes see Psalms of Solomon (16–17); also the discussions in Baldensperger (*Die Messianisch-Apocalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judenthums*, pp. 105 ff.); Schürer, vol. ii, pp. 496 ff.; Oesterley and Box (*The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, pp. 222 ff.).

The growth of our Lord's activities by means of emissaries (the Twelve) and the Herodian policy of compromise with Rome. Again, it is significant that it should have been during the mission of the Twelve, and, according to Luke, in consequence[1] of it, that our Lord and the movement which He was endeavouring to spread, received Herod's personal attention. The mission should probably be regarded as the most resolute effort which our Lord had yet made to force on a mass movement on behalf of His cause. From the philo-Roman point[2] of view of a Herod, there would have seemed to be dangerous possibilities in the growing power of an eschatological movement amongst the people.

But no reasonable doubt remains about Herod's attitude[3] to our Lord, and the part which he played in bringing about the withdrawal from Galilee, if the following views about the meaning and the historic setting of Luke xiii. 31–3 are correct.

Luke xiii. 31–3.

Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ προσῆλθόν τινες Φαρισαῖοι, λέγοντες αὐτῷ, Ἔξελθε καὶ πορεύου ἐντεῦθεν, ὅτι Ἡρῴδης θέλει σε ἀποκτεῖναι. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πορευθέντες εἴπατε τῇ ἀλώπεκι ταύτῃ, Ἰδού, ἐκβάλλω δαιμόνια καὶ ἰάσεις ἀποτελῶ σήμερον καὶ αὔριον, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι. πλὴν δεῖ με σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καὶ τῇ ἐχομένῃ πορεύεσθαι· ὅτι οὐκ ἐνδέχεται προφήτην ἀπολέσθαι ἔξω Ἰερουσαλήμ.

[1] Spitta (*Die synoptische Grundschrift*, pp. 214–15) justly claims that Luke's testimony on this point is trustworthy.

[2] For the relations between the Herods and Rome, see Schürer, *G. J. V.*, vol. i, pp. 360 ff. (Eng. trans., div. i, vol. i, pp. 400 ff., and div. i, vol. ii, pp. 1 ff.).

[3] The extent to which the pericope in Luke xxiii. 6–16 is historical is problematical; but even if, as some scholars hold (see Verrall, *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, April 1909; Streeter, *Oxford Studies in the Syn. Prob.*, pp. 229 ff.), the tendency to repose little or no trust in it (see e. g. Loisy, vol. ii, pp. 366 ff.) is misguided, it would be a mistake to look to this report for light on Herod's mind near the end of the Galilean ministry. After our Lord's departure and the check to the eschatological enthusiasm in Galilee which it implied, Herod would have ceased to trouble himself about Him. Moreover, in Jerusalem our Lord was in the toils of other foes. This new set of circumstances may very well have induced Herod to play a different rôle in Jerusalem from that in Galilee.

The trustworthiness of the passage. Luke alone has preserved this warning by certain Pharisees about Herod's ferocious designs and our Lord's reply. But that the conversation in its substance may be trusted is indicated by the fact that Luke possessed peculiarly intimate knowledge [1] of Herod and his court, and by its intrinsically genuine look.

The passage does not now lie in its historic context. The story now lies embedded in the so-called 'Reisebericht' of Luke (ix. 51–xviii. 14), which purports to be an account of our Lord's last journey to Jerusalem. But in this instance, as so often in this part of St. Luke's Gospel, it cannot be taken for granted that the grouping of material faithfully reflects the historic sequence of events. Thus, if, as regards the time and place of the conversation, help be looked for in its present context, it would appear that ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ (verse 31) our Lord was διδάσκων καὶ πορείαν ποιούμενος εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα (verse 22). Hence He cannot have received the warning in Galilee in the course of the last journey to the city, for on that occasion He went through Galilee in secrecy (Mark ix. 30). If the occurrence belongs to the last journey at all, Peraea, the other part of Herod's dominion, must have been the scene of it. In that case, our Lord must have gone to Jerusalem through Peraea, or, at any rate, must have contrived to exercise His ministry in that district for a brief period (i. e. a few days; cf. verses 32, 33) whilst on His way. But of this Luke knows nothing; on the contrary, his view is that the Samaritan route was taken (cf. ix. 51–6). It seems that no aid to the discovery of the original locality and occasion of the conversation is forthcoming from the Lucan context.

When and where did the incident occur? First alternative: the locality was Galilee, and the time was later than Luke ix. 9, *but earlier than the return of the Twelve.* From the terms of the warning we know that our Lord at the time was either in Galilee or in Peraea, and from His reply it is apparent that He was not in retirement from public life. If Galilee was the

[1] See the footnote on p. 27.

locality, Mark ix. 30[1] excludes a later moment than the close of the ministry in that district. On the other hand, Herod's concern about our Lord and His activity, and any steps which he may have taken ἰδεῖν αὐτόν (Luke ix. 9), doubtless mark the other chronological extreme.[2] On this view of the matter, the threat would have been uttered whilst the Twelve were away on the mission.[3] That conclusion is indicated by two considerations: (*a*) at the time of ix. 9 the mission of the Twelve was in progress; and (*b*) Jesus attempted permanently to abandon the Galilean ministry on the day when the Twelve returned.[4] If the warning was given in Galilee, the withdrawal from that country was, I think, His reaction to it.

But was there a Peraean ministry on the last journey to Jerusalem? Some uncertainty would attach to the above conclusion if our Lord, whilst He was on the last journey to Jerusalem, carried on a public ministry in Peraea. Mark x. 1 (ἔρχεται εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου) suggests that He did enter Peraea, but apparently only after He had reached Judaea. But Matt. xix. 1 (ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου) seems to mean that He travelled to Judaea by way of Peraea. It would appear to be a fair presumption that the Matthaean editor either advisedly omitted the Marcan καί before πέραν or did not find it present in Mark. Hence there is some reason to prefer the Matthaean to the Marcan

[1] Κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντες παρεπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ.

[2] Because xiii. 31–3 undoubtedly represents a later stage in the expression of Herod's antagonism than ix. 9.

[3] Prof. F. C. Burkitt (*The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 95) suggests that the warning came when Jesus landed at 'Dalmanutha' (Mark viii. 10 f.). The conjecture is based on the saying about 'the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod' (Mark viii. 15). It seems to me, however, that that saying is probably in an unhistorical context (see the remarks on pp. 42–4). On other grounds, too, Prof. Burkitt's proposal could be shown to be unlikely. But I cannot discuss it farther without anticipating later results of this inquiry.

[4] I am here obliged to assume a later result. See pp. 44–6.

reading.[1] For our present purpose, however, it is a question of subordinate importance whether our Lord took the Peraean or the Samaritan[2] route, as it could not be concluded from the mere fact of his presence in Peraea that He exercised a ministry there. If the Matthaean rather than the Marcan report reflects our Lord's movements, the natural interpretation of Mark x. 1 f. would be that He resumed the public teaching which is there referred[3] to only after He had crossed over to the west of the Jordan. On this matter Matt. xix. 2 (*καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ*) seems to be illuminative. The *ἐκεῖ* can refer back only to *τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας* (verse 1), and it appears to have more than ordinary significance. It looks as if the Matthaean editor has gone out of his way to emphasize the point that the 'healings' (which take the place of 'teaching' in Mark) occurred in Judaea.

Summary. It is uncertain whether Jesus took the Peraean or the Samaritan route to Jerusalem. In any case, there is no evidence in the Synoptics which establishes the fact of a Peraean ministry on the last journey.

Mark ix. 30 *offers further evidence that there was no Peraean ministry on the last journey.* Further support for the view that there was no public activity in Peraea in the course of the last journey to Jerusalem may be found in Mark ix. 30. Here the Marcan redactor has preserved the tradition that our Lord and the inner circle of His followers made the passage through Galilee in as much privacy as

[1] The *καί* before *πέραν* is omitted by the 'Western' text of Mark, but it is present in ℵBCL. Prof. F. C. Burkitt thinks that the *καί* does not belong to the true text of Mark (*The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 96. See also the interesting remarks which are there made in connexion with the route which Jesus is supposed to have taken).

[2] The Lucan view is that the Samaritan route was taken. See ix. 51–6. The passage has given rise to a good deal of discussion. See Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, ii, p. 923 f.

[3] *Καὶ συνπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς.*

possible (καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ). The fact that Luke (ix. 43) and Matthew (xvii. 22) have ignored this feature of Mark ought not to raise doubts about its historicity.[1] What motive could there have been for making our Lord go through Galilee in circumstances of secrecy if He did not in reality do so? None lies at hand. But the reason which the Marcan redactor gives for the steps which our Lord took to escape notice is not worthy of the same trust. It is said that he was at pains to avoid attracting notice because His followers, in spite of the earlier instruction at Caesarea Philippi, still needed to have it impressed upon them that a tragic fate would overwhelm Him in Jerusalem, but that μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας He would rise again (v. 31). It may fairly be doubted, however, whether this was our Lord's own real motive. The probability is that He avoided notice in Galilee at this period for much the same reason as He had left that country some time before; and that reason, as we shall presently conclude, was to prevent Herod from bringing His mission as a whole to a premature conclusion. The fact that the redactor has not given the probably true explanation of οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ is not surprising. For, as is conclusively proved by his grouping of material from the Feeding incident in vi. 34 f. down to the arrival at Bethsaida (viii. 22), it was not his purpose to represent that our Lord's departure from Galilee was a flight from Herod. And so it is not to be expected that he would be concerned to say that Herod's animosity influenced our Lord when He returned to Galilee for the last time. On this whole matter of the relations between Herod and our Lord the Marcan redactor seems to have been out of touch with the primitive historical tradition. Now if the true explanation of the secrecy of the journey through Galilee is this, that Jesus wished 'to avoid collision with the Herodian officials', we are entitled to go on to ask this question: why He should carefully avoid peril in Galilee but almost immediately afterwards openly court it in the southern portion of Herod's tetrarchy?

[1] See the discussion on pp. 103-4.

In the absence of good reason to the contrary, it should be allowed that ix. 30 holds good for Peraea as well as for Galilee. That is to say, Herod must be afforded no opportunity of thwarting those hopes about the realization of His mission which were drawing our Lord to Jerusalem.

Conclusion from Mark ix. 30. The remark means that Jesus wished to avoid the attention of Herod's officials, and it would have been as true of Peraea as of Galilee.

For the several reasons which have now been stated, the passage, Luke xiii. 31–3, should be placed in Galilee during the mission of the Twelve. But, as I shall show in the discussion which follows, the time when the warning came can be fixed with much more precision than that.

The meaning of the warning: Herod offered Jesus the choice between departure from Galilee and death. The reply: the Galilean ministry to be abandoned. In its main purport the conversation itself is not obscure: our Lord [1] was forced to choose between death at Herod's hands and permanent withdrawal from Galilee. That He really believed that this was the situation which now confronted Him seems to be quite clear from the tenor of His reply:[2] within a very brief period He would leave Galilee. This, however, is not what Luke himself meant. It is no matter for surprise that he did not do so, for he shows no knowledge of the actual historical circumstances of the incident, but has located it on the way to Jerusalem and interpreted it accordingly. Thus for him καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι doubtless referred to our Lord's entry into His glory after the completion of His earthly mission and His

[1] It is not to be supposed that the Pharisees who conveyed the warning sympathized with our Lord's aims; on the contrary, the rôle which they played ought probably to be interpreted in the light of Mark iii. 6, except that they appear to have been men who were ready to let their grievance against our Lord remain in abeyance, if He ceased to imperil the cause of Jewish orthodoxy in Galilee and left the country. Wellhausen, however, thinks that the mention of 'Pharisees' here is redactional (*Ev. Lucae*, p. 75).

[2] Wellhausen rightly remarks: 'Jesus scheint die Warnung ernst zu nehmen' (*Ev. Lucae*, p. 75).

death in the city. But probably Jesus Himself, in making His reply to Herod's threat, would have been contemplating the pressing peril in which He and His cause were now involved. Probably the Aramaic behind τελειοῦμαι meant, 'I shall have finished what I am now doing,'[1] i. e. the exorcisms and healings on which He was then engaged. The full form of the first half of the reply would originally have run thus: 'Go ye, and tell that fox, I shall[2] be casting out demons and completing (ἀποτελῶ) cures to-day and to-morrow, and on the third day I shall have finished.' The second half of the reply is more difficult. Considered in the light of the original meaning of verse 32, the words, πλὴν δεῖ με σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καὶ τῇ ἐχομένῃ πορεύεσθαι, mean that Jesus must journey from place to place in Galilee during the days in question, finishing certain cases of exorcism and healing. But if that is what our Lord meant, it is not clear how ὅτι οὐκ ἐνδέχεται προφήτην ἀπολέσθαι ἔξω Ἱερουσαλήμ can be explained. The fact that a prophet must not (οὐκ ἐνδέχεται[3]) die outside Jerusalem does not explain why Jesus lay under the necessity of prolonging the healing ministry over the brief period in question. I would therefore suggest that the words σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καὶ[4] in verse 33 were inserted under the influence of the idea that Jesus was making His last journey to Jerusalem at the time of the incident. If that proposal be correct, the second half of the reply originally ran: 'However, on the next day I must go, because a prophet must not perish outside Jerusalem.' Thus Jesus let Herod understand that within a very brief

[1] As a middle τελειοῦμαι is apparently not found in the N. T.; and it seems that the only instance to be cited from elsewhere is Iamblichus, *Vita Pyth.* 158.

[2] Present tenses with the force of futures, as, for example, in Matt. xxvi. 2, John xiv. 3, &c.

[3] With the case of John the Baptist fresh in His mind, Jesus could not have meant that it was literally impossible for a prophet to die outside Jerusalem.

[4] Wellhausen would go farther and remove καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι (verse 32) as also secondary. (See *Ev. Lucae*, p. 75.)

period He would be leaving Galilee; He would not accept death at his hands; He would go to meet that fate in Jerusalem. It appears from the passage that His departure from Galilee was not exactly a hurried flight; but there is nothing intrinsically unlikely in that; it is, indeed, in no way out of harmony with the terms of the warning, i. e. death in the event of a refusal to depart. Herod would not have given our Lord any choice at all if his one desire had been to kill Him. But, as a matter of fact, his chief concern was to suppress Him, and His work with Him. If he could achieve his aim without bloodshed, so much the better. He would incur less odium in those circles in Galilee which had lent a ready ear to our Lord's message.

Concluding statement about the passage. On the above interpretation, Luke xiii. 31–3 marked a momentous turning-point in our Lord's career. The crisis in Galilee had come to its climax. Plans and movements had now to be shaped with a definite reference to a peril to His cause which could not be ignored. He recognized now that if He remained in Galilee He would perish, and with Him the possibilities of accomplishing His mission. Therefore Galilee had to be abandoned within a few days and the cause carried elsewhere, striven for on another field. This was not the hour, nor was Galilee the place, to give His all, even life itself, for the sake of the Kingdom.

Luke xiii. 31–3 *and the Marcan account of the close of the Galilean ministry.* In Luke ix. 10 is a summary statement which throws out no objections to what I have said in connexion with xiii. 31–3. It is this: when the Twelve returned, our Lord immediately went away with them to Bethsaida Julias[1] in Philip's territory, and never again, it should be added, carried on an active ministry in Galilee. In Mark,

[1] The conjecture that there was a Bethsaida on the western side of the lake is unnecessary and lacks the support of definite evidence. See Sir G. A. Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, pp. 457 ff., and *Encycl. Bib.*, cols. 565–6; Swete, *S. Mark*, p. 146.

however, the sequence of events is not only very different, but it does not support the contention that Jesus terminated the Galilean ministry owing to the menacing attitude of Herod Antipas.

A sketch of the events at the end of the Galilean ministry according to Mark. As soon as the Twelve returned, our Lord took them by boat εἰς ἔρημον τόπον for the purpose of affording them rest and refreshment in privacy (vi. 30–2). It is explained that the pressure of the multitude made it impossible for the disciples to recuperate where they were. But the multitude refused to be shaken off, and noticing the spot for which the boat was making, got there first on foot, increasing their numbers as they went. A meeting took place which, so far as our Lord was concerned, was unexpected and accidental. Moved with compassion, He taught these people, and towards evening miraculously fed them. The Twelve were then despatched by boat to[1] Bethsaida, in the territory of Philip, whilst our Lord Himself remained behind to take leave of the multitude and to go into the hill-country for prayer. Presumably we are to understand that He intended to make the journey to Bethsaida along the shore alone and on foot. In the course of the journey across the lake, the Twelve encountered a contrary wind (vi. 48). From the land our Lord witnessed their distress, and at 'about the fourth watch of the night' walked across the surface of the lake and entered the boat. The storm subsided. When they landed, it was not at Bethsaida but on the shore of the plain of Gennesaret, a few miles south of Capernaum. Here our Lord was recognized at once; there was considerable popular

[1] The fact that Matt. (xiv. 22) omits 'to Bethsaida' need not mean that the words were absent from his Marcan source, for since the landing was made, not at Bethsaida, but at Gennesaret, he may have desired to relate a more straightforward story than Mark. If, on the other hand, the reference to Bethsaida be regarded as the work of a revising hand, it cannot on that account be treated as unauthentic. Only a person well informed as to our Lord's intention at the time of the departure would have ventured to make the insertion.

excitement; there was even a public tour of the neighbourhood. Here is located the famous controversy over 'clean and unclean' (vii. 1–23) to which reference has already been made (see p. 22). After this encounter with the Jewish officials, and apparently as one of its consequences, our Lord left the plain of Gennesaret and went away to the Tyrian district (vii. 24). He returned again to the sea of Galilee, coming through the Decapolis (vii. 31 f.). The report seems to mean that He still remained outside Herod's territory. After the incident of the deaf stammerer (vii. 31–7) comes the story of the feeding of the 4,000 (viii. 1–9); but it is useless to ask where the editor thought that this had happened. Then Jesus and His disciples went by boat εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθά. It is not said that He resumed His ministry in this neighbourhood. The only episode mentioned is that of 'the sign from heaven' (viii. 11–13). Almost immediately the boat set out again, this time for Bethsaida Julias (viii. 13, 22), which was reached. Never again was Jesus in Galilee, except secretly, on the last journey to Jerusalem (cf. ix. 30).

Observations on the above outline. Accepted at its face-value, this account does not point to a crisis in the Galilean ministry of the kind indicated by Luke xiii. 31–3. The religious officials, it is true, are our Lord's declared opponents, but nothing is said about any murderous designs on the part of Herod Antipas. There was no choice between death and the abandonment of the Galilean ministry. On the contrary, a good deal of freedom of action in Galilee still remained to Jesus when He left the country.

Features of the Marcan account of the close of the Galilean ministry which are either untrustworthy or liable to be misunderstood.

(1) *The present position of the controversy about 'clean and unclean'.* It has already been decided that vii. 1–23 belonged originally to an earlier moment in the ministry than that at which it now falls (see p. 22). If, therefore, immediately after,

and as a consequence of, the controversy related in vii. 1–23, our Lord undertook the journey to the north (vii. 24 ff.), this journey was not the final departure from Galilee, and so does not concern us now. If, on the other hand, vii. 1–23 and vii. 24 ff. are only artificially connected,[1] the reason for the departure to the Tyrian country is left unexplained by the Marcan redactor.

(2) *The landing at Gennesaret.* Another barrier which the Marcan narrative offers to the view that our Lord was driven from Galilee in the last resort by Herod Antipas is the story of the landing at Gennesaret and of the activity in that district (vi. 53–6). If, as Luke ix. 10 (cf. Mark vi. 45) indicates, it was our Lord's intention to conclude the Galilean ministry on the day on which the Twelve returned from the mission, how is it that next day He was again active in Galilee, and this, be it noted, within a mile or two of Tiberias, Herod's capital? It is worthy of notice, in the first place, that the Marcan story at this point, even in its present form, does not claim that our Lord exercised His ministry in the full sense of the term. He did not announce the coming Kingdom and summon the people of Gennesaret to repentance in view of its speedy arrival. He only healed sick folk.[2] That is to say, it is possible for us to hold that, so far as Galilee was concerned, our Lord considered that He had already concluded His efforts to achieve His real mission. But the edge of the objection is still farther turned by certain features of the narrative. Thus, the anxious haste (v. 55) of the people of the neighbourhood to bring their sick into our Lord's presence suggests that they knew that His visit would be of brief dura-

[1] If the connexion between vii. 1–23 and vii. 24 f. is unhistorical, it is quite likely that the journey to the remote northern regions was undertaken *after* the arrival at Bethsaida Julias (viii. 22).

[2] It should be remarked that the recollection of a measure of reluctance on our Lord's part to be engaged even in healing activity seems to break through the narrative. See J. Weiss, *Das älteste Ev.*, p. 222; Loisy, vol. i, p. 948.

tion.[1] If this is correct, we may fairly hold that His reason for not remaining long in Gennesaret was the desire not to attract the attention of Herod. Once more, the difficulty which the Marcan story in verses 53–6 raises disappears if it be true, as J. Weiss[2] and others hold, that our Lord landed at Gennesaret unwillingly. The acceptance of this view requires no straining at the evidence. Mark (vi. 45) tells us that the original objective of the boat journey was Bethsaida Julias, but a contrary wind (verse 48) prevented the immediate realization of this design, drove the boat out of its course, and rendered a temporary landing at Gennesaret (verse 53) necessary or desirable. If, then, our Lord did not go to Gennesaret with the intention of carrying on His ministry there, the reasons already put forward for the termination of the ministry in Galilee—pressure from Herod and the religious authorities—are not weakened by Mark vi. 53–6.

Summary. The landing at Gennesaret is without importance. It was involuntary; apparently Jesus did not stay long; and He merely healed a few sick people.

(3) *The feeding of the* 4,000 *and the subsequent events.* It seems to be apparent that the Marcan editor has unwittingly incorporated in his Gospel a second narrative of one and the same feeding incident and of the events which followed upon it.[3] In this narrative not only the disciples but our Lord as well entered the boat after the feeding of the multitude (viii. 10), and they came εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθά (Matt. xv. 39 εἰς τὰ ὅρια Μαγαδάν).[4] This tradition would lend support

[1] According to verse 56 Jesus toured the neighbourhood, ministering to the sick. But the verse is absent from the Matthaean parallel and ought probably to be regarded as interpolated in Mark. See Goguel, *L'Évangile de Marc*, p. 150.

[2] *Das älteste Evangelium*, p. 207.

[3] See the remarks of Wellhausen (*Ev. Marci*, pp. 58–9) and the full discussion by Prof. C. H Dodd (*Expositor*, October 1921, p. 273 f.).

[4] On 'Dalmanoutha' and 'Magadan' see Swete (*Mark*, p. 166) and *Encycl. Bib.*, cols. 985, 986, 1635, 2894. Nothing is known about 'Dalmanoutha' which prevents us from holding that in vi. 53 and viii. 10 the

to a surmise that the report in vi. 45–6 that Jesus Himself remained behind on the shore when the boat started for Bethsaida, is an editorial link devised to provide a necessary condition of the 'walking on the sea' (vi. 48). It is also important to realize that the silence about a storm on the lake in viii. 10 should not be understood to mean that the boat-journey to 'Dalmanutha' may have been voluntary. For it is obvious that a tradition according to which our Lord entered the boat at the commencement of the voyage is inconsistent with such a storm-scene as is recounted in vi. 47–52; hence this form of the tradition preserved no storm-story at all. This explanation of the silence about the storm enables us to understand why the second narrative does not make it clear that the original objective of the boat was Bethsaida Julias. As it was not possible to relate the storm-story, it was quite naturally supposed that our Lord must have gone designedly *εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθά.*

Summary. According to the first line of tradition Jesus did not enter the boat (vi. 45, 46) with the disciples after the Feeding incident; according to the second He did (viii. 10). But the first tradition preserved a storm-story in which Jesus walked on the sea (vi. 47–52). Therefore the Marcan redactor left Him behind on the shore (vi. 45, 46). In these circumstances, it is reasonable to suppose that the 'walking on the sea' is an instance of the introduction of miraculous features into the Gospel tradition. If that be so, the tradition that Jesus also entered the boat is to be preferred. But a tradition which made Jesus enter the boat along with the disciples could not preserve the storm-story as told in vi. 47–52. Thus there is no good reason for doubting whether the boat met with foul weather on this occasion. That is to say, the landing at Gennesaret was contrary to the intention of Jesus, who had desired to reach Bethsaida Julias in Philip's territory.

Marcan duplicate narratives relate one and the same landing at Gennesaret.

The events reported in Mark viii. 11–22

The refusal of 'a sign from heaven' and the departure to Bethsaida. In 'Dalmanutha' our Lord was challenged by the Pharisees to give 'a sign from heaven'. He refused to do so, left them, and crossed the lake with the Twelve to Bethsaida (verses 13, 22). Nothing is said about the reason for this departure, but it is not obscure. In our Lord's intention, the Galilean ministry ended with the first attempt to reach Bethsaida (vi. 45 f.). We need not therefore cast about for reasons as to why He left 'Dalmanutha';[1] He was simply carrying out His original purpose of permanently withdrawing from Galilee.

'*The leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod*' (viii. 15)

As the warning hardly presupposes so serious a situation as, according to Luke xiii. 31-3, had already developed, some observations about its present locality should be made.

In the course of the journey, so Mark represents, the disciples were warned against 'the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod' (verse 15). We ought perhaps to accept the Marcan form of the saying,[2] but it is quite open to doubt as to whether its present position in the Marcan story can be accepted with much confidence. Let us recall

[1] Prof. Burkitt (*The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 95) conjectures that the departure was in reality a hurried flight from Herodian officials; hence the reference to 'the leaven of Herod' and the want of provisions in the boat.

[2] Matthew substitutes 'Sadducees' for 'Herod' (xvi. 6); Luke has only 'Pharisees' (xii. 1). The Matthaean variation, as is usually pointed out, will bear a quite probable explanation: the redactor substituted 'Sadducees' for 'Herod' owing to his intention to interpret 'leaven' as 'teaching' (v. 12) —an interpretation which would not have suited the mention of Herod. There is nothing in the context of the Lucan version to suggest dependence on Mark. The proximity of a block of Q material (xii. 2–9 = Matt. x. 26–33) opens up the possibility that Q may have been the source. If so, we ought not in this instance to consider the Marcan version as forthwith discredited;

the circumstances. At the time our Lord and the disciples were leaving Galilee with the intention, as subsequent history shows, of never again coming within the reach of Herod. The disciples could not have been ignorant of the fact that a crisis had arisen for our Lord and His cause. They knew, we may be sure, what forces had conspired to bring it about, namely, the Pharisees and Herod. They understood, too, that the boat-journey meant abandonment of Galilee. To deny this knowledge to the inner circle of our Lord's followers would be to concede too much to the Marcan redactor's thesis that they were crassly stupid. What then is to be said about the warning against 'the leaven of Herod', with whom the Twelve were expecting to have nothing more to do? The figure itself would have been used in its bad sense, and the idea of 'corruption', or possibly of the 'Evil Yezer', would not have been far away.[1] In that case it would appear that the disciples were being put on their guard against the corrupting influence of our Lord's opponents. It could not have been His meaning that the contagion was likely to spread to the disciples themselves. Our Lord seems rather to have been thinking of the efforts of His antagonists to undermine the loyalty of His less intimate followers and to prevent any more Galileans from allying themselves with Him. Of these machinations and the success which might attend them the disciples, it would appear, needed to be made more fully aware. If the warning was evoked by some special demonstration of Herod's hostility, we do not know what it was. The present context affords us no help. It may well be

for Mark appears to show some acquaintance with Q (see Streeter, *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 165 ff.). In that case it is not impossible that he knew the Q version but considered his own to be the more authentic report. It is the kind of saying which might very well go back to Peter's reminiscences. On the whole, fewer difficulties seem to attach to the Marcan form.

[1] See Abrahams, *Pharisaism and the Gospels*, pp. 51 ff.; Schechter, *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, pp. 262–3.

that the reference to the tetrarch is sufficiently accounted for simply by the probability that he would lend 'the power of the secular arm to the guardians of the traditional system of piety'. If it be true that our Lord was thinking of the fortunes of His cause in Galilee and was seeking to induce the disciples to view the forces ranged against Him in truer perspective, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that the warning would have been more apposite at a time when the Galilean ministry had still a part of its course to run. In further support of an earlier moment of utterance, it should be remarked that verse 15 makes an awkward break in the course of the report; only by unsatisfactory means can it be maintained that verse 16 directly contemplates[1] verse 15.

Summary. Originally the warning was probably given at an earlier moment, whilst the Galilean ministry was still in progress.

Concluding observations about the close of the Galilean ministry in Mark

It may now be affirmed that the Marcan editor has obscured the actual course of events at the end of the Galilean ministry. He was either ignorant of, or not interested in, the reasons why Jesus left Galilee. In its present form, his account does not enable the reader to understand how dangerous and full of tension the actual historical situation was at that time. It should be supplemented with Luke xiii. 31–3, and divested of misplacements and certain secondary features. If the preceding discussion is sound, the boat-journey in Mark vi. 45 was intended by Jesus to be the final departure from Galilee. It so happened that foul weather compelled a landing at Gennesaret, but this return to Galilee was involuntary, brief, and had no important consequences. Accordingly, to all intents and purposes, the

[1] Wellhausen thinks that verse 15 circulated as an isolated saying of our Lord and that the Marcan redactor gave it an unhistorical setting. (See *Ev. Marci*, p. 61).

Galilean ministry ended on the day when the Twelve returned from their mission and the people were fed (Mark vi. 30–44)[1]. That is a conclusion which requires further comment. It will probably be admitted that the importance of the Feeding incident very largely depends on whether or not the meeting with the people was premeditated and purposeful on our Lord's part. If, in the earlier part of the day on which He intended to leave the country, He had no anticipations of the Feeding, the historic, inner meaning of the event can hardly have been very important. But that is just what certain features of the Marcan story seem to imply. There the Feeding appears as an unforeseen occurrence between the withdrawl εἰς ἔρημον τόπον, which was made for the purpose of affording the Twelve rest[2] and refreshment in privacy (vi. 31–2), and the attempted abandonment of Galilee in the evening (vi. 45). But the accidental character of the meeting with the people depends on the historicity of vi. 31–3, which is justly questioned by Wellhausen (*Ev. Marci*, p. 47 f.). In his source the redactor would have found the locality of the Feeding described as ἔρημος τόπος (verse 35); hence our Lord and the Twelve had to be brought εἰς ἔρημον τόπον (v. 32) to meet the people there. The conjecture that vi. 31–3 is merely editorial acquires additional support from the fact that there is no trace of the alleged motive of the boat-journey[3] when the landing is made. If we may

[1] This is not the case in the Lucan tradition (ix. 11–17), where the feeding takes place only after Galilee has been abandoned. The intention of Luke to give only the briefest summary of our Lord's movements and experiences from the return of the Twelve up to the arrival at Bethsaida seems to have had a good deal to do with the misplacement of the Feeding narrative. Spitta thinks that the narrative did not originally lie in the 'Grundschrift' (which Luke is following); it was added later from Mark (*Streitfragen*, p. 87; *Die Syn., Grundschrift*, pp. 218 ff.).

[2] According to Matthew (xiv. 12, 13) it was the news of the Baptist's death which induced our Lord to make the boat-journey εἰς ἔρημον τόπον. This means that He did not receive the news till the Galilean ministry was virtually over—which seems to be improbable in the extreme.

[3] The recuperation of the Twelve.

venture to divest the story of the meeting with the people of its accidental character, it becomes possible to regard all the proceedings—the teaching and the feeding alike—in the light of the fact that the Galileans were about to know our Lord no more. We may perhaps take it for granted that amongst this considerable group of people there would have been many, if not the bulk, of our Lord's most devoted adherents. This meal with His own was the act by which He consciously sought to wind up the Galilean ministry. It was a result of the tragic circumstances of the hour; and it was probably intended to pledge the loyal afresh to life in the coming Kingdom.[1]

III. Jesus and the Galileans

The theory that Jesus left Galilee partly owing to a loss of many of His former adherents is not established by Synoptic evidence. Hence, so far as the Synoptics are concerned, it may be concluded that the course of events in Galilee would not have led Him to discard the rôle of prophet as useless for Jerusalem.

The theory is often put forward that towards the end of

[1] Schweitzer has advanced the view that 'with the morsel of bread which He gives His disciples to distribute to the people He consecrates them as partakers in the coming Messianic feast'. The Feeding 'was from the point of view of Jesus a sacrament of salvation' (*Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, Eng. trans., p. 375; cf. *Das Abendmahl*, ii, p. 57). In *Das ält. Ev.* (p. 217) J. Weiss said: 'Die Speisungen sind Antecipationen des Herrenmahls' and 'Weissagungen auf den Tod Christi'. In reference to this it should be said that our Lord Himself did not at this time foresee those special circumstances which gave the Last Supper its historic significance (see the later discussion on pp. 140f.). M. Goguel, not without justice, remarks: 'Si l'évangéliste avait aperçu un rapport entre la mort de Jésus et la distribution du pain, il aurait su l'exprimer clairement' (*L'Eucharistie*, p. 53). The French scholar's own view is that the Feeding was 'une anticipation du banquet messianique' (p. 57).

the Galilean ministry a process of disintegration set in within the movement of repentance, and that this was one of the reasons why Jesus abandoned Galilee. That opinion is not without importance for the problem as to the rôle which Jesus proposed for Himself in Jerusalem. In Galilee His purpose was expressed in the main in the call to repentance in view of the coming Kingdom (cf. Mark i. 14, 15, Matt. iv. 12–17). If a gulf arose between Him and many of His former adherents, it is possible that he would have felt that the rôle of prophet would be useless in Jerusalem. The Synoptics, however, do not provide evidence that after a while our Lord lost ground amongst the people of Galilee. On the contrary, the mission of the Twelve, which belongs to the period in question, shows a widening of the area of the movement of repentance. And the intervention of Herod and the religious leaders proves that the movement would have continued to spread, if Jesus had been left free from interference. Against this conclusion it is irrelevant to cite the Parable of the Sower,[1] the rejection[2] at Nazareth, or the condemnation of the Galilean towns.[3] For these only mean that a relatively small proportion of the people of Galilee responded in a whole-hearted manner to our Lord's appeal.

Two Johannine passages (vi. 15, 66)

John vi. 15 Ἰησοῦς οὖν γνοὺς ὅτι μέλλουσιν ἔρχεσθαι καὶ ἁρπάζειν αὐτόν, ἵνα ποιήσωσιν αὐτὸν βασιλέα, ἀνεχώρησε πάλιν εἰς τὸ ὄρος αὐτὸς μόνος.

The episode was a result, and not a cause, of the crisis in Galilee. According to this Johannine passage, Jesus withdrew from the people after the Feeding owing to an attempt to make Him a king. In this, however, there is nothing which disturbs the conclusions already reached about the

[1] Mark iv. 1–20 (cf. Matt. xiii. 1–23, Luke viii. 4–15).
[2] Mark vi. 1–6 (cf. Matt. xiii. 53–8, Luke iv. 16–30).
[3] Matt. xi. 20–4, Luke x. 13–16.

causes of the crisis in Galilee. For if it be historic,[1] the incident was probably a result, and not in any case a cause, of the crisis. That becomes clear when the historical situation is recalled. On the day of the Feeding Jesus intended to carry out His decision, made a few days before, to abandon Galilee; on the morrow he expected to be in safety outside Herod's territory.

The historical significance of the incident. What was the historical significance of this highly interesting episode? A question will perhaps put us on the right track. When our Lord and the people came together on the memorable day of the Feeding, how much did they know about the state of affairs between Him and His opponents? Doubtless they were aware that the struggle for His cause had evoked bitter and dangerous antagonism; they may even have known that matters were hastening to a crisis; but until they had learnt from our Lord Himself that Galilee must of necessity be abandoned, they would have been uncertain as to how He would meet the storm. It seems in every way probable that in the course of the teaching which preceded the Feeding (Mark vi. 34) He would have intimated to the people not only that He was about to take leave of them, but also why He was no longer free to carry on His mission in Galilee. It is true that the intrinsic probabilities of the case are the only basis of this assertion; but in this instance they do not seem to be insufficient for the purpose. Are we prepared to say that our Lord slipped quietly away from Galilee, knowing that He would not return again for active ministry, without making His followers acquainted with what He was doing and why He must go? Few things are so unlikely as that. Let us suppose, then, that the teaching of Mark vi. 34 included

[1] The story of the Feeding in the Fourth Gospel appears to rest on that of Mark (see Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, vol. iii, pp. 215, 217). The pendant in vi. 15 is without a parallel in the Synoptics. But in this instance, as in others, it would be rash to regard their silence as of decisive importance. The passage certainly wears an authentic look.

an intimation that, owing to Herod's ruthless intervention, Jesus could no longer carry on His mission in Galilee. How would this be received? With grief, we may be sure, but with indignation, too, at Herod's action. At such a tragic moment our Lord's followers must have been in the grip of strong emotions. Is it too rash a theory that the attempt to make Him a king was at bottom an energetic protest against His passive policy towards the machinations of Herod? May we not venture to say that what the people really wanted to do was to keep our Lord in Galilee and to contest the issue with Herod by violent means? Let Herod be defied and our Lord Himself become a king! Here was a proposal which Jesus could not endorse. Not in that way could the interests of His mission be furthered. For the present nothing remained but exile.

Summary. Some of the followers of Jesus wanted to keep Him in Galilee and to meet Herod's hostility with force. With that policy Jesus could have no sympathy. The episode in no way shaped His decision to leave Galilee, for it occurred too late.

John vi. 66 *ἐκ τούτου πολλοὶ ἀπῆλθον τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, καὶ οὐκέτι μετ' αὐτοῦ περιεπάτουν.*

A defection amongst our Lord's followers, but only after the Galilean crisis had reached its climax. In this verse mention is made of a loss of adherents, following on a mystical discourse which had proved unacceptable to them. The defection is said to have occurred (see verse 22) on the day after the Feeding of the people. Thus it cannot have had anything to do with our Lord's intention to leave Galilee.

The explanation of our Lord's departure from Galilee offered by Albert Schweitzer

Dr. A. Schweitzer thinks it right to say that our Lord fled from Galilee—not, however, from Herod Antipas and the religious officials, but from the people. I here sketch the theory[1] in briefest outline.

In the Galilean period Jesus expected that the Kingdom of God would come together with the approaching harvest. It could not come, however, until the pre-Messianic general tribulation (πειρασμός) had taken place, for only thus could the guilt of the people be put away. At the end of this time of trial, in which He too would share, Jesus believed that He would be manifested as the supernatural Son of Man, after either death or metamorphosis. He sent out the Twelve to announce that the End was nigh. So near was the new order of things that the πειρασμός would begin before they had finished their hasty journey through the cities of Israel. It would bring them low, perhaps to death. But the πειρασμός did not occur; the disciples returned safe and sound. 'And now suddenly, the moment the disciples return, His one thought is to get away from the people . . . who dog His footsteps in order to await in His company the appearing of the Kingdom of God and of the Son of Man—to await it in vain.' Jesus separated Himself from the people of Galilee because events had shown that the πειρασμός would not begin of itself. And His notion of the πειρασμός itself now underwent a transformation. 'In the secret of His passion which Jesus reveals to the disciples at Caesarea Philippi, the pre-Messianic tribulation is for others set aside, abolished, concentrated on Himself alone, and that in the form that they are fulfilled in His own passion and death at Jerusalem. That was the new conviction that had dawned upon Him. He must die for

[1] See *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, Eng. trans., *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, pp. 357, 358, 361, 362, 385–9.

others . . . that the Kingdom might come.' He set out for Jerusalem towards Passover to provoke the authorities to get rid of Him. He had no intention of teaching. He went 'solely in order to die'.

The unsatisfactory critical basis of the theory. It is clear, I think, that no good case can be made out for Dr. Schweitzer's opinion about the withdrawal from Galilee unless the Matthaean version of the charge to the Twelve (x. 5–42) be historical. It is declared to be 'historical as a whole and down to the last detail'. But the weight of critical opinion is against Dr. Schweitzer on that matter; and with good reason.

The charge to the Twelve in its present form was probably put together very largely for the purpose of heartening Christian missionaries in Palestine in a time of persecution and of disquietude over the delay of the Parousia. But whether that be so or not, it is entirely unlikely that the saying about the coming of the Son of Man[1] (x. 23) belonged to the original charge. It is not probable that our Lord made use of this Messianic title during the Galilean ministry. Further, for verses 17–22 the redactor does not appear to have been dependent on a non-Marcan source in which they formed part of the charge. Doubtless he drew the verses from the Apocalyptic oration (cf. Mark xiii. 9, 11–13); if not, we should have expected to find a doublet in chapter xxiv. 9 f., where, however, a mere summary of Mark xiii. 9–13 is given. Again, it is not impossible that verses 24–31 were addressed to the Twelve before they went out; they make a good coherence; and as it is implied that the Beelzebul controversy had already taken place (verse 25 b), they can fittingly be assigned to that late period of the Galilean ministry to which the mission of the Twelve belongs. But as it is not said that others besides the Twelve would be exposed to a damning charge (verse 25 b), and the risk of death (verse 28), it cannot

[1] *Ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ τελέσητε τὰς πόλεις τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, ἕως ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.* For further remarks on this passage see p. 98, and for a short discussion of the 'Son of Man' question as a whole, see pp. 92 f.

fairly be urged that our Lord was preparing the Twelve beforehand for the coming of the πειρασμός, or general tribulation.[1] The same verdict cannot be passed upon the localization of verses 32–3 (see p. 85). There now remain verses 34–42, of which 40–2 are irrelevant to the question at issue. The sayings about taking the cross and finding and losing life (verses 38, 39) are placed by Mark at the Confession-scene (viii. 34, 35). The fact that the Matthaean editor has followed Mark and again reported the sayings at Caesarea Philippi (xvi. 24, 25), is a clear indication that he had no special knowledge that they originally formed a part of the charge to the Twelve. In grouping the sayings with the charge the editor's interests were evidently topical and not historical in character. It will be urged later on that the remaining verses—which concern the domestic strife which loyalty to our Lord and His cause will involve, and set the claims of that loyalty above family obligations (34–7)—have not been correctly located.[2]

Concluding statement. The opinion that our Lord withdrew from Galilee partly owing to waning support has no basis either in the Synoptics or in the Fourth Gospel. Further, no evidence remains for Dr. Schweitzer's novel theory when the charge to the Twelve in Matthew is critically examined. It may therefore be affirmed once more as a matter of history that our Lord was driven from Galilee by Herod Antipas and the religious officials.

[1] In support of his own view, Dr. Schweitzer declares that at the time of the mission there was nothing in the historical situation to induce Jesus to warn the Twelve that He was sending them out on perilous business. He made a 'prophecy of storm while the sky was blue'. But the evidence points the other way. Few things are so certain as that Jesus and His immediate followers were in growing peril after the Beelzebul controversy.

[2] See pp. 69, 81 f.

The Bearing of the Crisis in Galilee on our Lord's Purpose in going to Jerusalem

Jesus left Galilee with the intention of prosecuting His mission in Jerusalem under the favourable conditions offered by Passover. We have seen that the opposition to Jesus in Galilee increased *pari passu* with the growth of the movement of repentance. At the last, Herod Antipas, supported by the religious leaders, forced Him to choose between permanent departure from Galilee and death. He decided to leave that country. But, as we know from subsequent events (see also Luke xiii. 33), the withdrawal was a profoundly purposeful act. It was motived, not by thoughts of personal safety, but by the intention of a transference of activity after a while to Jerusalem. How purposeful the departure was may be realized from the fact that He selected Jerusalem *at the time of the Passover* for the resumption of public activity. The presence of masses of His fellow-countrymen, drawn from all quarters, the heightened religious atmosphere recalling the redemption of Israel—these conditions Jesus resolved to turn to the service of His cause.

The crisis in Galilee convinced Jesus that He could prosecute His mission in Jerusalem only at the cost of His life. There can be no doubt that the ultimate aim of our Lord's work, in Jerusalem as well as in Galilee, was the ingathering of His countrymen into the Kingdom of God. If the crisis in Galilee led Him to modify His conception of His mission, the modification would have related, not to that ultimate aim, but to the method of its realization. There is good reason to believe that such a modification did result from the course of events in Galilee. In that country His rôle was primarily prophetic.[1]

[1] To be more precise, the primary purpose of our Lord's activity in Galilee seems to have been the extension of the work of John the Baptist. In common with others, He accepted the prediction of Malachi (iii. 1, iv. 5, 6; see, too, Ecclesiasticus xlviii. 10 and 'Eduyyôth viii. 7; also Weber, *Jüd. Theol.*, p. 352 f., and Volz, *Jüd. Eschat.*, p. 192) that Elijah would return and

The essential features of His mission there were the announcement of the approach of the Kingdom of God and the demand for repentance as the preparation for it. But it is probable, on general grounds, that after, and as the result of, the Galilean ministry Jesus ceased to believe that He could accomplish His purpose simply in the rôle of prophet. He would have foreseen another crisis forced on by His foes. For in the capital He would be directly under the civil jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin,[1] where the influence of the Pharisees at this period appears to have been predominant.[2] He would have known full well beforehand that the Sanhedrin would not allow Him to prosecute His mission for long without a struggle. And what then? Only two ways of personal safety would be open to Him—He might fling Himself on the people for support, or He might withdraw from Jerusalem as He had done from Galilee. We know that He did not avail Himself of either of these alternatives. And it is not likely that He would have had any intention of doing so. It is true that He could at any time obtain a powerful following

make a way of escape from the judgement through repentance. But, in His own conviction, this movement of repentance had already begun, for Elijah had returned in the person of the Baptist (see Mark ix. 13, Matt. xvii. 12, 13, Matt. xi. 17 f. = Luke vii. 24 f. There is nothing in these passages which makes it likely that Jesus did not identify the Baptist with Elijah until after He came to Galilee). John, however, had been removed by Herod Antipas (Mark i. 14). But the nearness of the new order of things made it necessary that Elijah's preliminary task should be accomplished. Hence Jesus came to Galilee. It is not, of course, expressly stated in the Gospels that that was His notion of His work, but it seems to me to be sufficiently clear on general grounds.

[1] That was not the case in Galilee. See Schürer, *G. J. V.*, vol. ii, p. 206.

[2] I follow Schürer, who, speaking of the Romano-Herodian period, says: 'Den thatsächlich grössten Einfluss hatten während dieser Zeit bereits die Pharisäer, deren Forderungen die Sadducäer, wenn auch widerwillig, sich fügten, weil sonst das Volk sie nicht ertragen hätte (*Antiq.* xviii. 1. 4). Diese Äusserung des Josephus lässt uns einen tiefen Blick in die Verhältnisse thun: das formell unter der Leitung der sadducäischen Hohenpriester stehende Synhedrium steht factisch bereits unter dem übermächtigen Einfluss des Pharisäismus' (vol. ii, p. 201).

amongst the people if He cared to accept their terms. But in Galilee He had rejected that opening as leading to the betrayal of His cause.[1] And it is to be expected that He would have had no thought of disavowing in Jerusalem that earlier judgement. But neither is it likely that He contemplated flying before the storm, as He had done in Galilee. Luke xiii. 33, indeed, indicates that He intended to let the storm in Jerusalem break over Him. And that passage is supported by general considerations. For Jesus the withdrawal from Galilee was no more than a temporary thwarting; but He would have realized that departure from Jerusalem, when the crisis developed, would mean final defeat. In Jerusalem there would be no great hope to draw Him away, as there had been in Galilee. There could be no departure from the city with the thought of aiding His cause. So far as general considerations go, it seems to me to be clear that Jesus would have anticipated that the prosecution of His mission in Jerusalem would involve His death.

Jesus became aware that His death would be a vital factor in the accomplishment of His purpose. In what way Jesus connected with His mission the fate which He foresaw awaiting Him can only be fruitfully discussed when the significant evidence comes before us. It may be observed here, however, that if He contemplated accepting a heavy fate in Jerusalem, without at the same time regarding it as a vital factor in the accomplishment of His mission, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that He would also have realized that Jerusalem would witness the final *débâcle* of His work. But no one who pays due regard to the evidence and to the intrinsic probabilities of the case will allow that He went up to Jerusalem expecting His cause to die with Him. He expected success, but at the cost of His life.

Jesus went to Jerusalem to preach as well as to die. It should be observed that the situation at the close of the ministry in

[1] See the discussion of John vi. 15, on pp. 47–9 f.; cf. also Matt. iv. 8–10, Luke iv. 5–8.

Galilee does not suggest that our Lord set out for Jerusalem 'solely in order to die'. If the programme He had followed in Galilee had led to no result, that view might have something in its favour. But in the rôle of prophet He had obtained a considerable measure of success. That is attested in an eloquent fashion by the desperate measures resorted to by the religious and civil authorities. Recall, too, how considerable a company of our Lord's followers is said to have participated in the meal when He was about to leave Galilee. What the course of events in that country seems to me to point to is this, that Jesus went to Jerusalem both to preach and to die. And that, as we shall see, is also the purport of the direct evidence itself.

II

THE CONFESSION SCENE

The importance of the period of the wanderings outside Galilee. It has already been observed that our Lord was no less drawn away from Galilee by a great hope than He was driven out by His foes. Of the positive considerations which induced Him to leave Herod's territory doubtless the most weighty was this: He intended to mould and press into the service of His cause those special circumstances which the next Passover would bring with it. It is in this purposeful waiting that we are to seek the explanation of the period of wandering outside Galilee, when He appears to have ceased to make the public proclamation of the Kingdom. From the fact that we do not hear that He was at any time in Herod's dominions, or that He came within the civil jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin (i. e. Judaea), we are to understand that He carefully safeguarded Himself against dangerous entanglements for the sake of the fateful decisive days lying ahead. In all other respects the importance of the period of wandering is inner and personal. Now our Lord made known to the disciples that more developed conception of His rôle which the crisis in Galilee had compelled Him to frame. It will be the aim of the present chapter to discover what His disclosures were.

The Confession scene as given by Mark (viii. 27—ix. 1, cf. Matt. xvi. 13–28, Luke ix. 18–27). The incident to which the closest attention must be given is that which is located in the Marcan story on the way to the villages of Caesarea Philippi (viii. 27 ff.). It will open the way to discussion if in the first instance we take the report at its face-value. Our Lord and the disciples had set out from Bethsaida (v. 22), whither they

had come by boat. At some moment of the somewhat lengthy journey to the northern border of Philip's tetrarchy Jesus precipitated a discussion touching His person and His rôle in Jerusalem. He addressed to the disciples the question, Τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι; They told Him that in popular opinion or surmise He might be John the Baptist (risen from the dead), or perhaps the returned Elijah, or again He might be 'one of the prophets'. From this it appears that our Lord was considered to be a very significant personage, but that Messiahship was not attributed to Him. The views which were finding expression amongst the people were evidently inferences from the fact that He had been proclaiming the speedy arrival of the Kingdom of God and making an urgent call to be ready for it. They would tend to prove, if proof were needed, that in Galilee He had not laid open claim to Messiahship. The redactor appears to have attached small importance to these opinions, for he relates no comment on our Lord's part, but passes on at once to the question, Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; Peter, he tells us, called out, Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός. The response to this bold avowal was the stern warning (ἐπετίμησεν) against telling any man about Him. And then, as if fully aware of the gulf that yawned between Him and the disciples over the question of Messiahship, our Lord proceeded to instruct them about the destiny of the 'Son of Man' (who is identical with Himself): the hierarchy in Jerusalem would compass His death, but 'after three days' He would rise. 'And He spoke the word (i. e. the teaching in verses 31–3) with confidence (παρρησίᾳ).' But when Peter hailed the Lord as ὁ Χριστός his convictions about the destiny of 'the Messiah' were so far removed from those which He now began to unfold as His own that he took it upon himself to make a passionate protest. Quickly came the tremendous indictment that in seeking to draw our Lord away from the path of suffering and death Peter was serving the purposes of Satan. The next thing we hear (verses 34–5) is that Jesus summoned τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ. His purpose

now was to declare that none of those present could be His followers except at the cost of martyrdom; however, such as were willing to accept a *via dolorosa* would save their lives, i. e. live again in the Kingdom of God. What have verses 36–8 to do with this line of thought? Having regard to the purpose of verses 34, 35, we ought probably to treat verses 36–8 as being illustrative of an attempt to make the hearers understand the fatal consequences of a refusal of martyrdom. As verse 38 indicates, the perspective is now eschatological: do those who shrink from following the Lord in suffering and death realize what their lot will be at the Judgement? Forfeiting the higher personal self by their act of faithlessness, they will have no means of buying it back again in that fateful hour, not even if they shall have 'gained the whole world' in the meantime. The Son of Man at His coming will be 'ashamed' of those who in the present age were 'ashamed' of our Lord and His words. Thus in effect it would have appeared to the readers of Mark that Jesus now began to teach that for the ὄχλος as well as for the μαθηταί martyrdom was necessary for entry into the Kingdom; μετάνοια no longer sufficed. Presently we shall consider whether this representation ought to be treated as historical.[1] Meanwhile ix. 1 remains to be noticed. Here is a promise that the Kingdom of God would come ἐν δυνάμει within the lifetime of some of the audience. It can only be conjectured[2] in what way the redactor conceived that this word of solace came into line with the thought of the preceding verses. But it is clear, I think, that if the foregoing material is substantially trustworthy and in its historic setting, ix. 1 should not be retained in its present position. For, according to verses 34, 35, martyrdom awaited those who now accepted the stringent demands of discipleship; and, as for those who did not do so, they would never see the Kingdom of God.

I now turn to the question of the historical value of the Marcan report.

[1] See pp. 65–6.

[2] I make a suggestion on pp. 85–6.

The historical value of the Marcan account of the Confession scene considered, first of all, in the light of the Matthaean and Lucan reports.

The Confession scene in Matthew (xvi. 13 ff.). Except at verses 17–19, the Matthaean editor clearly draws his material from Mark; his amplifications and departures do not appear to be of the kind which require the supposition that he made use of any other source. We need only notice the more obvious of these divergences.

According to this report the incident took place not 'on the way' (ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ) to Caesarea Philippi, but after τὰ μέρη Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου had been reached (cf. ἐλθὼν . . . ἠρώτα). But this seems to be due to the fact that the editor has eliminated the story of the healing of the blind man at Bethsaida (Mark viii. 22–6), and with it the geographical note (καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν); hence the Marcan expression ἐξῆλθεν (verse 27) could not be fittingly employed; and in the process of the remodelling of sentences which then became necessary, ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ was discarded (as also καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ). Thus a measure of disagreement over the setting of the incident need not rouse suspicion about Matthew's use of the Marcan report, nor cause doubt at the outset as to whether Mark is really in touch with the facts.

In the same verse Matthew makes use of the title ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, but in this instance it is peculiar to him, and is undoubtedly only editorial. In the opinion of the present[1] writer, the Aramaic expression ((א)בר נש) of which ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is a literal translation, was used by our Lord (but not publicly until the trial) as His Messianic self-designation. The key to the meaning of the title is to be sought in that apocalyptic tradition relating to 'the Man' which found literary embodiment in Dan. vii, Eth. Enoch xxxvii–lxxi, and 4 Ezra xiii. If this be correct, we need not hesitate to say

[1] A brief discussion of the 'Son of Man' question as a whole will be found on pp. 92 f.

that our Lord would not have taken it for granted that the disciples were quite well aware that He had identified Himself with that supernatural figure, 'the Man', before hearing what they had to say about His person.

Again, to Mark's list of those whom the people were disposed to believe that the Lord might be, Matthew adds Jeremiah; in that he stands alone. In some quarters, it would appear, Jeremiah was expected to return as a herald of the Kingdom of God. Legend had already been busy with his name (cf. 2 Macc. ii. 5 ff.); and he was to come again along with Isaiah (cf. 4 Ezra ii. 18). In filling out the Marcan picture the Matthaean editor seems only to have been drawing on his knowledge of current expectation.

The hand of the editor again shows itself in the phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος (verse 16). When he made this interpretative expansion of the Marcan ὁ Χριστός he was designedly establishing a contrast with the title ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου,[1] itself unhistorical alike in place and in meaning.

According to verse 17 our Lord praised Peter for the fact that he had not received from human lips the knowledge that He was ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος, but from God Himself. This does not appear to admit of reconciliation with the sharp rebuke of Peter for attempting to draw our Lord from the path of suffering and death in Jerusalem (verses 22, 23); one or other of these features of the narrative is doubtless unhistorical. Our Lord would not at one moment have invested Peter's knowledge of His person with all the authority of a divine revelation and at the next have branded the Apostle as an agent of Satan.

The authenticity of verses 18, 19 lies open to the same objection as verse 17. To examine in detail the various grounds on which many modern[2] critics are unable to carry

[1] The editor here 'prepares the way for the doctrine of the two natures', says Holtzmann (*Das Messianische Bewusstsein Jesu*, p. 73).

[2] See for example the discussion of Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity*, vol. ii, pp. 349–52.

this pericope (17–19)—which is peculiar to Matthew—back to our Lord, would raise issues irrelevant to our main concern.

I pass on to the report of the command to the disciples to tell no man about the Messiahship (verse 20).

The redactor makes the Marcan *περὶ αὐτοῦ* (verse 30) precise (*ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός*), and, influenced by his story of the commendation of Peter, he seeks to remove the suggestion of 'censure' or 'rebuke' from the order of silence by substituting *διεστείλατο* for the Marcan *ἐπετίμησεν*[1] (Luke *ὁ δὲ ἐπιτιμήσας*).

In verse 21 the editor introduces the expression *ἀπὸ τότε* as a literary device intended to bring out the fact that our Lord now began to make fresh disclosures to the disciples about His rôle (cf. iv. 17). He quite naturally inserts *ὁ Ἰησοῦς* (or more probably *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*, with ℵ*B*). See McNeile, *St. Matthew*, p. 244), and then prefers to write *αὐτόν* in the place of the Marcan *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* for stylistic reasons. As in the preceding verse, he is at pains to remove any indefiniteness from his source; hence the insertion of *εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα*. As in Luke, the first formal prediction of suffering in Matthew concludes with *καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι*, whereas Mark winds up with *καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι· καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει*. It is unlikely that Matthew as well as Luke would have omitted *καὶ παρρησίᾳ . . . ἐλάλει* independently of each other, if they had found this comment in their copy of Mark.

In verse 22 the words *Ἵλεώς σοι, κύριε· οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο* are nothing more than another instance of editorial explanatory amplification. And when in the next verse the editor proceeds to omit the Marcan *καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ*, and to substitute *εἶπεν τῷ Πέτρῳ* for the *ἐπετίμησεν Πέτρῳ*, he is remembering his story of the Lord's praise of Peter. From the editor's point of view, it was not fitting that the Apostle

[1] *ἐπιτιμάω* = 'censure', 'lay under a penalty'. See Moulton and Milligan, *Vocab. of the Greek N. T.*, vol. iii, p. 248.

should be rebuked in the presence of the other disciples, amongst whom, by divine favour, he ranked first. But by suppressing *ἐπετίμησεν* he is also trying to soften the asperity of the reprimand of Peter which he has to relate so soon. And that probably explains the insertion of the words *σκάνδαλον εἶ ἐμοῦ*, by which he sought to limit the sense in which the Apostle was espousing the cause of Satan.

Before paying further attention to Matthew's account of this famous scene, it would be well to turn to the Lucan parallel.

The Confession scene in Luke (ix. 18 ff.). Luke's report differs in several ways from that of Mark. He introduces the story in terms peculiar to himself. Prior to the Confession Jesus was engaged in prayer. There is no mention of Caesarea Philippi. Observe, too, that by bringing the incident into close temporal connexion with the withdrawal from Galilee, Luke corrects Mark, who places it at the end of the wanderings outside that country. Again, Luke gives no account of Peter's rebuke of the Lord and the crushing rejoinder. And there are other minor departures. In order to account for the several variations, it does not seem necessary to suppose that the Lucan account of the Confession scene does not rest on Mark.

Thus, verse 18 a (*καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον κατὰ μόνας συνῆσαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί*) ought probably to be regarded as only an editorial literary transition [1] from the feeding of the five thousand, framed with reference to Mark vi. 46, where Jesus goes into the hill-country alone to pray.

Again, in leaving it to be understood that the locality of the incident was the neighbourhood of Bethsaida, Luke

[1] Loisy remarks: 'Il est évident que le narrateur, ayant volontairement omis les faits qui suivent, dans le second Évangile, la première multiplication des pains, se souciant d'ailleurs assez peu de la précision géographique et voulant rejoindre Marc, se pourvoit d'une entrée en matière imitée d'autres passages (iii. 21, v. 16, vi. 12), simple transition littéraire' (*Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, vol. ii, p. 3).

does not directly traverse the Marcan representation (cf. ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ).

Further, Luke (as was said above) forsakes the Marcan tradition—undoubtedly quite rightly (see pp. 88–9)—when he makes the famous discussion follow quickly on the arrival in Philip's territory. But it would be precarious to argue from this instance of independence that Mark was not his source for the actual facts of the conversation. The event was of such outstanding importance that it would be surprising if the knowledge did not long persist in instructed circles that it occurred at the beginning of the wanderings. Luke need only have drawn on an authentic floating tradition relating to that particular point. In that case, the error in sequence in Mark (and in Matthew) simply illustrates the fact that strict historical considerations were subordinate to his primary purposes in editing his material.

I pass on to the question of Luke's silence about Peter's rebuke of the Lord and the reaction which, according to Mark, it provoked.

It may very well be that Luke drew up verse 21 (ὁ δὲ ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτοῖς παρήγγειλεν μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο. Mark: καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ) with the idea of compensating in a measure for an intentional elimination of the so-called second Peter-scene in Mark. In the Marcan parallel the rebuke relates to the secrecy in which the disciples' beliefs about our Lord's person were to be kept. In Luke, on the other hand, the words ὁ δὲ ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτοῖς refer back to the confession, the idea of the secrecy being preserved by the use of παρήγγειλεν. Thus, in spite of the omission of the second Peter-scene, Luke, as well as Mark, makes our Lord disavow Messiahship as understood by the disciples. It rather looks as if ὁ δὲ ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτοῖς represents Luke's effort to preserve the really permanent significance of the Lord's rebuke of Peter, while in all other respects he wished to suppress it.

As for the other non-Marcan features, προφήτης τις τῶν

ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη (verse 19), instead of εἷς τῶν προφητῶν, need be no more than an editorial interpretation of the Marcan original, which can be understood in that way. The 'historically more exact'[1] ὁ Χριστός of Mark is expanded into τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ—possibly for the benefit of the readers. The report of the prediction of suffering and death follows Mark closely; but that concerning resurrection agrees with the Matthaean version. It has already been observed that at this point (and at verse 32) Mark appears to have undergone revision.

The historical value of the second part of the Confession scene in Mark considered in the light of the Matthaean and Lucan reports (Matt. xvi. 24–8, Lk. ix. 23–7)

Matt. xvi. 24–8

Matthew (as also Luke) is in disagreement with Mark over the composition of the audience. He writes: τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ (verse 24 a), whereas Mark: καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. Luke has: ἔλεγεν δὲ πρὸς πάντας. The fact that elsewhere Matthew (x. 38, 39) and Luke (xiv. 27, xvii. 33) have parallels to some of the material which follows, Q being the source, indicates (if indication be needed) that here they rest on Mark. Hence Matthew and Luke either deliberately excised the Marcan reference to the presence of the ὄχλος, or they did not find it present in their copy of Mark. If they were aware that the ὄχλος was mentioned in Mark, it is difficult to believe that they would have ventured to make so important a modification of their source as to limit the range of the teaching about losing and saving life to the inner ring of disciples.[2] Words at once so threatening and yet so profoundly solacing are just what we should expect them to retain at their times. Doubtless some revising hand, after Matthew and Luke had employed Mark, rewrote the introductory words in Mark and inserted the reference to the

[1] Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 304.

[2] For the meaning of the Lucan πρὸς πάντας see p. 67.

ὄχλος. The redactor's desire would have been to make his readers understand that the teaching was applicable to them too. The Lord had glanced into the future, had foreseen the sufferings which His followers of a later period would be called upon to endure, had warned them of the perils of disaffection, and promised them the rewards of loyalty.

Matthew (verse 25 b) and Luke (verse 24 b) omit the Marcan καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (verse 35), which we may assign to the same reviser as above.[1]

Apart from small verbal changes, the Matthaean editor follows Mark closely until he comes to the saying about the fate of those who are ashamed of our Lord and His words (verse 38). Here, instead of reproducing his source, he condenses it into a brief prediction of the coming of the Son of Man to execute judgement. The Marcan passage can be paralleled from Q (Matt. x. 33, Luke xii. 9), and as Matthew had already related the Q saying, it may not be argued that the Marcan saying did not come before him in its present form. There can be little doubt that the Matthaean editor intentionally summarized Mark, his desire being not to say again in detail what he remembered to have said already in x. 33.

In the next verse Matthew has ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ, whilst Mark has ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐληλυθυῖαν ἐν δυνάμει. Although Matthew doubtless does justice to our Lord's mind in representing that at the winding up of the age the Son of Man would come, and that in the new order which would ensue the office of ruler would be His,[2] it appears from the Lucan parallel (ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ) that the Messianic title did not lie before him in Mark. Here the Matthaean editor displays his tendency to heighten the eschatological colouring of his material.

[1] Cf. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, vol. ii, p. 213. Wellhausen remarks that 'das Evangelium ist der von den Aposteln gepredigte Christus' (*Ev. Marci*, p. 67).

[2] See the discussion of the 'Son of Man' problem on pp. 92 f.

Luke ix. 23–7

We have already anticipated to some extent the discussion of the latter part of the Confession scene in Luke, but something further needs to be said about the introduction to the pericope. The Lucan representation is that at this time Jesus was κατὰ μόνας (verse 18), but only in so far as the ὄχλος was concerned (cf. συνῆσαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί). Accordingly, on any natural interpretation, πρὸς πάντας in verse 23 refers to the whole body of the intimate disciples, but to them only. Thus, as has already been said, in the unrevised form of Mark which came before Luke (and Matthew) only the disciples appear to have been addressed.

In adapting material to cover the situation in which his readers were finding themselves, Luke adds an unhistorical καθ' ἡμέραν (verse 23) to the Marcan ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ. Moreover, with Matthew, he omits καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (verse 24). Again, after throwing into a different form the words about gaining the whole world and paying the ψυχή in forfeit, he omits altogether the ἀντάλλαγμα saying, 'peut-être parce qu'il n'eût pas été sans obscurité pour qui ne connaissait pas les termes employés par les Sémites' (Lagrange, *Saint Luc*, p. 269). Luke also clearly draws from Mark (verse 38) the saying about the coming of the Son of Man, but he has eliminated ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ . . . ἁμαρτωλῷ—apparently in order to give the words an abiding significance—and has distinguished the δόξα of the Son of Man from that of the Father and of the holy angels.[1] Finally, he has omitted ἐληλυθυῖαν ἐν δυνάμει from Mark ix. 1—perhaps 'weil er die βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ selbstverständlich vom vollendeten Gottesreich versteht' (B. Weiss, *Die Quellen des Lukasevangeliums*, p. 41 n.). On the other hand, as we cannot be sure that Matthew found the phrase in Mark, there is room for doubt as to whether or not it is due to a later hand.[2]

[1] Loisy: 'Luc a paraphrasé Mc. 38 . . . plutôt pour la solennité de l'expression que pour le développement de l'idée' (vol. ii, p. 26 *n.*).

[2] The phrase 'pourrait être aussi bien et plutôt une expression paulinienne

Summary. It results from this discussion that, except in one particular which is of special importance,[1] namely, the presence of the ὄχλος from verse 34 onwards, the Marcan report of the famous episode came before Matthew and Luke almost entirely in its present form. The testimony of these Evangelists, however, only brings to light the shape which the Marcan story had assumed at the time when they made use of it. Valuable as that witness is, it cannot in itself be regarded as a guarantee that their copy of Mark faithfully portrayed the historical situation. The Marcan report must, therefore, be submitted to further critical investigation.

Examination of the Marcan account of the Confession scene in the light of (a) Q *and* (b) *its intrinsic and general historical probability.*

Down to the point at which Peter confesses the Lord to be ὁ Χριστός, the record may doubtless be accepted as genuine;[2] but the rest of the story requires careful consideration.

The Marcan verses (34 b, 35, 38) *which appear to rest in some sense on the earlier document* Q.[3] By Matthew the Q parallels to the Marcan verses 34 b, 35 are placed at x. 38, 39, and by

(cf. Rom. i. 4), adoptée par l'évangéliste pour caractériser la manifestation finale du royaume par rapport à son commencement dans l'Évangile ou dans l'Église' (ibid. ii, p. 28).

[1] For remarks on the significance of this editorial feature see p. 101.

[2] Contending that the historic fact is that our Lord was not believed to be the Messiah, even by the disciples, until after His death, Wrede (*Das Messiasgeheimnis*, p. 115 f., *et passim*) sought to undermine the whole confession scene. The course of criticism has rendered that broad feature of Wrede's work untenable. See e. g. the acute discussion of A. Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Hist. Jesus*, p. 336 f.

[3] The explanation of the relation of Marcan parallels to Q remains uncertain. See Streeter, *Oxford Studies in the Syn. Problem*, pp. 165 ff.; Moffatt, *Introd. to the Lit. of the N. T.*, pp. 204 ff. Wellhausen held that Q was later than Mark (see his *Einleitung*, pp. 73 ff.), but critical opinion on the whole is against him.

Luke at xiv. 27, xvii. 33. Now the fact that the verses in Matthew, x. 34–9, cohere well with one another suggests that the pericope is original so far as the grouping of material is concerned. In that case, *if*[1] the words about taking the cross and saving and losing life are correctly localized at the Confession scene, the discourse which our Lord then addressed to the disciples appears in Mark in a mutilated form. The full discourse included an intimation that domestic strife was one of the unavoidable consequences of His ministry (Matt. x. 34–6), and that the demands of discipleship override family loyalties. But the fact that in Luke the pericope is broken up (Matt. x. 34–9, Luke xii. 51–3, xiv. 26, 27, xvii. 23) requires consideration.

The present context of Luke xii. 51–3, being probably artificial,[2] need not raise any doubts about the original unity of the pericope in Matt. x. 34–9. There is, however, elsewhere a Lucan feature which, if genuine, would make the Matthaean grouping artificial. I refer to the introduction (*συνεπορεύοντο δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, καὶ στραφεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς*) to the account of the sayings about the priority of the demands of discipleship, and bearing the cross (xiv. 26, 27). But there are good reasons for regarding the introductory verse as only editorial. Luke had just recounted the parable of the Messianic feast (xiv. 16–24), spoken, it is claimed, in 'the house of one of the rulers of the Pharisees' (verse 1). As he proposed to continue his Gospel with material unsuitable to the same audience, Luke was in need of an introduction and a literary transition at xiv. 25. In framing this, he quite naturally gave particular expression to the notion (which is not historically sound) with which he worked throughout the whole of ix. 51—xviii. 14 : our Lord was journeying to Jerusalem. Thus, so far as Luke xiv. 26, 27 is concerned, we may

[1] I argue later on (see pp. 81 ff.) that the Marcan grouping of these sayings is historical.

[2] On pp. 106–8 I discuss somewhat fully the connexion of Luke xii. 49–50 with xii. 51–3, and conclude that it is not original.

continue to regard the Matthaean pericope (x. 34–9) as a unity.

Luke further splits up the pericope under discussion by embedding his parallel to the saying about finding and losing life in the material which relates to 'the day when the Son of Man is revealed' (xvii. 22–37). Here it can scarcely be in its original position. 'The moment of the Parousia is not a time in which life can be saved or won. The opportunity for choice has passed' (Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, vol. ii, p. 1016). That in joining the logion to that about taking the cross Matthew has preserved the order of Q is suggested by the independent testimony of Mark. It cannot be taken for granted that the order of sayings in Q was historical, but in this instance there is good reason for accepting the sequence.

Summary. The material in Mark viii. 34 b, 35 is only a fragment of a discourse, a fuller account of which appeared in Q (Matt. x. 34–9, Luke xii. 51–3, xiv. 26, 27, xvii. 23). There is good reason for believing that Matthew has preserved the order of the verses in Q and that that order is trustworthy.

The historical value of Mark viii. 34 b, 35 *considered in the light of the* Q *parallel* (*Matt.* x. 38, 39, *Luke* xiv. 27, xvii. 33).

Mark viii. 34 b

On the supposition that the expressions ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν[1] and ἀκολουθείτω μοι (Mark viii. 34 b) are synonymous, an awkward tautology arises which is not likely to be original and which disappears when ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν is taken to mean εἶναί μου μαθητής. The Lucan version of the Q saying (xiv. 27 ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου, οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής) seems to leave little room for doubt that such was the original significance. It is true that Matthew has the milder οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος (x. 38). But as in the next

[1] ἐλθεῖν ℵABC², &c.; ἀκολουθεῖν C*DX, &c.

verse (which we have decided to be in its historic sequence) it is announced that life in the coming Kingdom can only be won by first losing it in this world, the Matthaean variant is doubtless an intentional editorial softening of the original saying. For the rest, except for the amplificatory *ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτόν*, Mark does no more than throw into a more positive form the Q report of the logion.[1]

Mark viii. 35

It is obvious that Matthew (x. 39) and Luke (xvii. 33) do not rest on a common Greek translation of Q; they appear rather to represent independent renderings of Aramaic Q. The similar way in which the logion opens in Mark (*ὃς γὰρ θέλῃ κτλ.*) and Luke (*ὃς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ κτλ.*) suggests that Luke is more original than Matthew (*ὁ εὑρὼν κτλ.*). And yet, on the other hand, Matthew and Mark each have *ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ* which is missing in Luke. If, however, the phrase *ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ* now found in Matthew x. 39 was not in Q, its presence in Mark ought probably to be attributed to a revising hand. It is certainly risky to assign *ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ* to Q. For besides the silence of Luke, there is the possibility that when he wrote the latter part of chap. x, the Matthaean editor was influenced by previous knowledge of Mark viii. 35, and so inserted *ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ* in x. 39. It is safer to hold that the logion is best preserved in the Lucan version, in relation to which the Marcan account, except for *ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, varies only in the matter of vocabulary.

Summary of conclusions about Mark viii. 34 b, 35. The Lucan *εἶναί μου μαθητής* (xiv. 27) is to be preferred to the Marcan *ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν* (verse 34 b). The Marcan words *καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου* (verse 35) are interpolated; probably also *ἕνεκεν*

[1] Loisy (ii, p. 23) and Wellhausen (*Ev. Marci*, p. 66) throw doubt on the originality of the reference to the 'cross'. But crucifixion was a familiar spectacle and may have become typical of a violent end. Allen supports this view by citations from rabbinical and classical sources (*St. Matthew*, p. 111).

ἐμοῦ. For the rest, the purport of the Marcan form of the sayings is in substance the same as that of Q.

Mark viii. 38

At verse 38 the Marcan story is again secondary. Here is an adaptation of the latter half of a Q saying, the full form of which is preserved in Matthew at x. 32–3 and in Luke at xii. 8–9. The fact that the Marcan words καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους . . . ἁμαρτωλῷ are absent from Q makes against their authenticity; and for the same reason ὅταν ἔλθῃ . . . τῶν ἁγίων is probably an editorial supplement. In the fact that the Marcan redactor has ἐπαισχυνθῇ in place of ἀρνήσηται in Matthew (Luke: ὁ δὲ ἀρνησάμενος) we may perhaps see an indication that he has used (perhaps recollected) Q under the influence of Rom. i. 16. Again, it would be a fair presumption that the redactor employed the Messianic title (καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπαισχυνθήσεται αὐτόν) because he was aware that it occurred in Q. In that case, Mark's evidence goes a long way towards settling the dispute between Matthew (ὁμολογήσω κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ) and Luke (καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁμολογήσει ἐν αὐτῷ) as to whether the title did lie in Q. Further consideration of the Marcan form of the logion is unnecessary; the Q version must be the centre of interest. What we shall want to know later on is whether Mark has preserved the proper locality of unmutilated Q. For the present we will notice only one aspect of this question—the grouping in Matthew and Luke.[1]

The present context in Matthew and Luke of the Q *version of Mark* viii. 38. If Matthew x. 26 b–33 be placed side by side with the corresponding verses in Luke xii. 2–9, it becomes unnecessary to cast about for special reasons which may have induced the Evangelists to place the logion where it now lies; doubtless they have simply followed the sequence of verses in Q. If one were convinced that the whole Q pericope

[1] I discuss the other side of this question, namely, whether the Q version belongs to the Confession scene, on pp. 81 f.

formed an original unity it would be necessary to consider whether Matthew, who makes it a part of the Charge to the Twelve in Galilee, is right; or Luke, for whom it formed an incident of the journey to Jerusalem; or whether Mark has given us the clue to the occasion by assigning an adapted fragment of it to the Confession scene. But the pericope seems to be composite. For it is not probable that the combination of the argument about the completeness of God's knowledge of human beings with the thought about being confessed and denied by the Son of Man at the Judgement is due to our Lord. Luke himself found the connexion difficult, for he has prefaced the latter logion with λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν (xii. 8).

Summary. Mark viii. 38 is a fragment of a saying which appears in its fuller form in Q (Matt. x. 32–3, Luke xii. 8, 9). But the connexion of the logion with the rest of the Q pericope is probably artificial.

The trustworthiness of those parts of the Confession scene in Mark which are without parallels in Q

The rest of the Marcan report of the Confession scene cannot be paralleled from verifiable Q. How far it is authentic can be estimated only by recourse to judgements about its intrinsic and general historical probability; hence the conflict of critical opinion on the subject.

The order of silence[1] *in* viii. 30 (Matt. xvi. 20, Luke ix. 21). Mark informs us that Peter's declaration that our Lord was the Messiah drew from Him a warning against proclaiming this belief in public[2] (viii. 30). Is this historic? or have we here an interpolation designed to support a special theory, or to serve an apologetic interest, in connexion with the Messiahship? If the Judas problem be ignored for the present, the first open avowal of Messiahship came from our Lord Himself in response to the question of[3] the high-priest; the disciples

[1] The preceding verses seem to me to require no discussion. See p. 68.

[2] Καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ.

[3] Mark xiv. 62 (cf. Matt. xxvi. 64, Luke xxii. 67 f.).

said nothing about it in public during the ministry. At bottom the historicity of viii. 30 turns on the reason for the disciples' silence. The passage would have to be eliminated as a projection into the narrative if it could be shown, or rendered probable, that at no time in the ministry did the disciples believe that they were in the presence of 'the Messiah'. On the other hand, if they did hold that He was 'the Messiah', the undoubted fact of their silence becomes inexplicable unless they had been laid under a charge of secrecy.

Wrede's reasons for rejecting the order of silence. For Wrede, who argued that belief in our Lord's Messiahship arose only after the conviction in regard to His resurrection, the prohibition was the outcome of later unhistorical theorizing. Our Lord (it was supposed) must have known all along that He was the Messiah; therefore, as the fact had not been recognized, He had consciously veiled His real being from the world. And yet there must have been esoteric knowledge; the disciples must have been aware of His secret. Similarly, too, the demons, being supernatural powers, must have penetrated His thoughts; hence they must have hailed Him as Messiah. Thus, according to Wrede, the several orders of silence, whether made to the disciples (viii. 30, ix. 9), or to demoniacs (i. 25, 34, iii. 12), or after other healings (i. 43, v. 43, vii. 36, viii. 26), as well as the references to the desire for concealment in vii. 24, ix. 30, had, as their common motive, the preservation of the Messianic secret (cf. *Das Messiasgeheimnis*, p. 36). But they are 'unhistorical one and all' (p. 47); our Lord was not in reality accorded Messianic dignity either by disciples or by demons.

Objection to Wrede's view, and summary. Since the publication of Wrede's book the objection has been urged again and again[1] in one form or another how the post-resurrection Messianic faith could ever have taken root unless the soil had been prepared at some time during the days of the

[1] See for example Bousset, *Jesus*, pp. 167 ff.

ministry; and it seems to be a fatal objection. There would, therefore, be nothing to the point in a further probing of the question as to whether Peter really did confess our Lord to be ὁ Χριστός. We may accept the report that he did so as historic without hesitation, and along with it, as furnishing the required explanation of the disciples' silence about the Messiahship, the command to be silent in viii. 30.[1]

[1] I append further remarks on Wrede's view about the other orders of silence. It may very well be that the Marcan redactor intended the demoniac incidents to be powerful pieces of apologetic; but if so, it would be arbitrary to conclude on that account that they had no basis in fact. The requirements of the case would, as a general rule, be more adequately met by the hypothesis that authentic material has been adapted to a special purpose. Doubtless our Lord did heal people believed to be possessed by demons; and if so, it is not historically improbable that an injunction against concluding that He was the Messiah accompanied the ministration. In certain quarters, at any rate, it was believed that the Messiah would destroy the demons. 'He shall redeem all the captivity of the sons of men from Beliar; and every spirit of deceit shall be trodden down.' 'Then shall all the spirits of deceit be given to be trodden under foot.' Test. Zeb. ix. 8, Test. Sim. vi. 6 (Charles, *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*). It is likely enough, therefore, that there was a tendency to infer from the fact that our Lord was announcing the coming of the Kingdom, and at the same time was doing something which the Messiah was expected to do, that He Himself might be that person. One of the reasons by which Wrede sought to find a basis for his rejection of the orders of silence was this: if the Messiahship was to be kept a secret, why is it reported that our Lord commanded silence only in certain instances of exorcism and healing, and not in all? (p. 48). But surely particular circumstances must be taken into account. An injunction appended to the stories of the healing of the paralytic and of the withered hand, for example, would have been absurd; for hostile Pharisees would never have thought of connecting Him with the Messiahship. Wrede also objected (p. 48; similarly Montefiore, *The Syn. Gospels*, vol. i, p. 65) that our Lord could not have expected to prevent the publication of the news of His 'miracles'. This is no doubt true in the main; but it is also an instance of mistaken emphasis and obscuration of our Lord's intention. It was not the mere publication of the news of His 'miracles' that He was primarily concerned about, for these were a verification of His message of the Kingdom (Matt. xii. 28, Luke ii. 19); He anxiously sought rather to leave no room for an inference from 'miracles' to Messiahship. This may reasonably be taken to be the underlying thought of the several prohibitions (cf. Mark i. 34, iii. 12). In the fact that powers of exorcism were exercised

The announcement of the Passion and Resurrection in Mark viii. 31

In the discussion of the 'crisis in Galilee' it was concluded that our Lord anticipated a *via dolorosa* in Jerusalem; it seemed historically very probable that He must have done so. It will not, therefore, be arbitrary if we approach viii. 31 predisposed to accept that one broad fact.

One could not, it is true, utilize inferences from the course of events in Galilee if it could be shown that our Lord conceived Himself to be lifted above, and able to ignore, history and circumstance. That was certainly not the case in Galilee. It is curious how some critics, apparently not looking much beyond the epithet of 'the fox', are ready to think that our Lord defied Herod in the sense of paying no heed to his threat. In reality it is quite clear that He was compelled to bring the Galilean ministry to a premature close owing to the historical situation which Herod and the religious officials had created. This revealing action on our Lord's part ought to induce us to think of Him as reckoning beforehand with the historical circumstances which would confront Him in Jerusalem—conscious certainly of power to mould them, but at a cost.

There is, perhaps, one other consideration which should make us pause before turning to account the inference from Galilee. Is it likely that our Lord entertained the idea that His person would remain inviolate in Jerusalem, not because He would be under special divine protection, but on the ground of a belief that the Kingdom of God would suddenly appear, He and His own entering into it, not through the *ianua mortis*, but by glorious transformation? This is only surmise. It seems to me that there is no evidence which requires the view, but much could be adduced which is irreconcilable with it. That verdict might be supported by an

by others (Matt. xii. 27, Luke xi. 19), without, we may doubtless suppose, Messiahship being thought of, He would have found occasion for believing that the orders of silence would have the desired result.

argument of a general character. Our Lord certainly did not go to Jerusalem passively to await the *dénouement*; otherwise He must have conceived that He had accomplished His earthly mission when he left Galilee, which no one would urge. He certainly went to Jerusalem with the purpose of completing a task which was as yet anything but complete. To deny that would be to make the motive of His journey incomprehensible. It is necessary to beware of losing touch with reality. The task in view was a concrete thing. And Jesus must have thought of it in terms of a following. It could not be unobtrusive, without visible manifestations, and unknown to the authorities in the city,—which is only to say that it would bring Him into peril. If the hypothesis which is under consideration is to have any meaning, Jesus must have expected that a storm would gather as a result of His work in the city, but that before it burst and overwhelmed Him the Kingdom would come by a dramatic *coup* from heaven. But the evidence points the other way; and I think it is trustworthy in that respect. It will come under consideration as the discussion proceeds.

Mark viii. 31 *is not a report of the 'ipsissima verba' of our Lord. The trustworthiness of the announcement of the Passion. The unhistorical use of the title 'the Son of Man'.* The saying in Mark viii. 31 does not pretend to be more than a bare condensation offering leading thoughts; for ἤρξατο διδάσκειν κτλ. implies that Jesus spoke at some length. But (as I have already urged) the representation that He expected death in Jerusalem, through the instrumentality of the hierarchy, is trustworthy.

It is not probable, however, that the use of the title ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is historical.[1] Here it is represented that our Lord divested the Messianic title of its historical associations (which are to be sought in Dan. vii, Enoch 37–71, 4 Ezra xiii), and included suffering, death, and resurrection in His rôle as 'the Son of Man'. But it is inconceivable how our Lord could have believed that during His earthly life He was 'the

[1] See the fuller discussion of 'the Son of Man' question on pp. 92 f.

Man' of the Daniel-Enoch tradition in any other sense than that it was He Himself who would be invested *later on* with the powers and prerogatives of that august figure. According to the apocalyptic view, 'the Man' was a divine or semi-divine being who would not be revealed until the time and for the purpose of the Judgement. Dr. Charles (*The Book of Enoch*, p. 308) holds that our Lord's use of the title was 'permeated throughout by the Isaian conception of the Suffering Servant'. It may be granted that this view holds good for the Synoptic Evangelists; it is dubious when carried back to our Lord Himself. A number of sayings are saved, but the problem itself is not really illuminated, by an assumption that our Lord so dislocated the apocalyptic programme of Daniel and Enoch as to propound the doctrine that 'the Son of Man' had appeared on earth before the time of the Judgement, without the glory, functions, and powers of that heavenly being, and withal to suffer, die, and rise again. If our Lord did make 'the Son of Man' the subject of predictions of the Passion, He would have used the title paradoxically—meaning that although He was destined to be revealed later on in all the splendour and power of 'the Man', His present rôle was one of suffering and death. The critical alternative to this view is that in viii. 31 and in all similar passages (cf. ix. 12, 13, 31, x. 33, 45, xiv. 21, &c.) an original personal pronoun 'I' has been displaced in conformity with a non-eschatological usage of the title which became current in the early Church.

Another element of the prediction which raises difficulties is the announcement of the resurrection. The Synoptic sources represent that our Lord conceived of His resurrection apart from His parousia. They were two distinct events separated by an interval of time, probably short but certainly real, and differently motived—the resurrection being a brief visit to personal adherents for their comfort and solace, the parousia being a return for judgement and the inauguration of His perpetual reign as 'the Son of Man'. But it is

unlikely that our Lord ever drew this distinction between resurrection and parousia. His only return would be for judgement[1] and the Kingdom, and then He would abide for ever with His own. This is more than surmise. In a feature of viii. 31 which rightly represents His mind (I refer to the expectation of death) our Lord was obviously anticipating events in Jerusalem. And doubtless the same should be said about the original form of viii. 34, 35. In other words, He and any disciples who accompanied Him to the city would all die there together. As will presently[2] be urged, the authentic forms of viii. 31, 34–5 were spoken on one occasion and to the same audience, which was the small body of intimate disciples. It is strange, to say the least, that in one breath our Lord should have spoken to them of a short preliminary return, and in the next told them that they would die, and so by implication never witness it, or draw any comfort and hope from it. Such a poignant fact as that would surely have stamped itself more noticeably on the tradition. And, on the supposition that our Lord did hold out the hope of a resurrection, it is a highly singular thing that all three streams of tradition—the Pauline, the Marcan, the Lucan—relating to the Last Supper, should be silent about this preliminary reappearance. Having regard to the fact that He was then envisaging the future, we might reasonably look for some allusion to a temporary return. But, instead of that, we find Him engaged with thoughts of the permanent reunion in the fully-realized Kingdom.[3] There is no need to open out the question as to the actual fact lying behind the resurrection narratives: whatever its nature it was doubtless unexpected. One can readily understand, therefore, that as time went on, and the delay of the End provoked perplexity and

[1] In agreement with O. Holtzmann: 'To him the third day is not merely the day of resurrection, but also, at one and the same time, the day of judgement' (*Life of Jesus*, p. 337, Eng. trans.).

[2] See the discussion about the grouping of the material on pp. 81 ff.

[3] See pp. 140 ff.

discouragement, and hope waned, certain predictions which originally referred to the Parousia were recast and applied to the resurrection experience.

Summary. It would appear that the historic nucleus of viii. 31 contained a prediction of the Passion in Jerusalem, and of the Parousia of 'the Son of Man'.

The trustworthiness of the second Peter scene

Little requires to be said about the second scene between our Lord and Peter. No redactor, or spurious tradition, would have created an incident so damaging to the Apostle. The concluding words (ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς κτλ.), however, look like an explanatory addition.[1]

Mark viii. 36, 37

The eschatological purport of the sayings is not alien to our Lord's mind; it certainly seems to be inadmissible to find their origin in a Pauline source.[2]

Mark ix. 1

It is possible that there may be a mark of Pauline influence in the phraseology (cf. 1 Cor. iv. 20). But 1 Thess. iv. 15 may well be reminiscent of a saying very like ix. 1. In view of our Lord's denial of knowledge about 'that day or that hour'[3] (Mark xiii. 32, Matt. xxiv. 36), the implication of ix. 1 that some of the hearers would die before the arrival of the Kingdom, seems to indicate that the original saying[4] has undergone a modification owing to the fact that some had died, and still the End tarried.

[1] E. Wendling (*Die Entstehung des Marcusevangeliums*, p. 114) cites Rom. viii. 5, Phil. iii. 19, Col. iii. 1, to show that the expression φρονεῖν τά is 'thoroughly Pauline'; similarly, 1 Cor. ii. 11, in connexion with the pointed contrast τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

[2] Wendling holds, justly it would seem, that verse 36 was not derived from Phil. iii. 8 (p. 112).

[3] Apparently in substance a Q passage recalled by Luke in Acts i. 6–7.

[4] Loisy rightly suggests 'Ceux qui sont ici ne mourront pas' (ii, p. 28).

The trustworthiness or otherwise of the grouping of the material which we have accepted as historical

The theory that Mark viii. 31–viii. 38 *is an interpolation.* Speaking broadly, all that follows Peter's confession is battle-ground for the critics. We have already accepted the present position[1] of the order of silence. Did our Lord go on to predict suffering and death in Jerusalem, to be followed after a while by His parousia? According to M. Loisy, who in this respect is in agreement with other distinguished critics, it is not likely that viii. 31 is founded 'sur une parole du Christ traditionnellement gardée (i, p. 92; see also ii, pp. 15 ff.). It is a *vaticinium ex eventu* attributed to our Lord to explain away the offence of the cross. That is one answer; but for reasons already put forward we may venture to set it aside. It lacks historical and psychological probability. Confining, then, the dispute to the matter of the grouping, let us suppose that no prediction occurred at viii. 31. In that case, what gave rise to the second Peter scene?—certainly not the order of silence (verse 30); therefore that scene also must be removed from its present position. And what then? One has only to ask—and if verse 31 be wholly fictitious, it is necessary to ask—what preparation exists for the startling disclosures contained in the rest of the chapter, to realize that everything which now falls between the prohibition in verse 30 and the saying about the coming of the Kingdom in ix. 1 is interpolated. M. Loisy, indeed (followed by M. Nicolardot, *Trois Premiers Évangélistes*, p. 270), declares that this is very probably the case (ii, p. 20).

The difficulties attending a removal of verses 34 *and* 35 *from their present context.* It is unfortunate, however, for the above proposal that the position of verses 34, 35 should have the support of certain general considerations which cannot be ignored. Would any one seriously deny that our Lord at

[1] See pp. 73–5.

the time of these verses was contemplating some definite concrete historical situation with which it was necessary for the loyal to make their reckoning? He saw a crisis ahead, and called on his followers to look at it with open eyes. In Galilee no known crisis of the required character arose or threatened to arise except that precipitated by Herod and the Pharisees. In order to assign the sayings to the Galilean period, one must somehow explain them in reference to that particular set of circumstances. How is it possible to do so? One gathers from our Lord's reply to Herod (Luke xiii. 31 f.) that the cause of the Kingdom of God did not at that time demand the surrender of life, but rather its preservation. It is true that He only spoke of His own life, but it would be absurd to say that He considered it possible and desirable that He Himself should escape the menace, but not possible or desirable that the disciples should do so. In the event, they all left Galilee in safety. If, therefore, the sayings belong to the period before the departure, it must be supposed that there was a time when our Lord was convinced that Herod's designs would engulf Him and the disciples. But it is inconceivable how this supposition can be made plausible. It means that when the storm actually broke our Lord was firmly resolved to take steps to continue the mission elsewhere, but that some little time before He believed that Galilee would see it brought to a tragic climax. Apart from the sayings in question, there is nothing in the Synoptic sources which suggests that that is a correct portrayal of the movements of our Lord's mind shortly before the end of the Galilean ministry. A sober criticism will not venture to make the sayings the basis of a reconstruction which is both unsupported in other ways and intrinsically unlikely.

Where, then, should the utterances in verses 34, 35 be placed? It is clear, I think, from the Synoptics that after Herod's intervention our Lord and the disciples were not again exposed to pressing peril—indeed, as we have remarked

elsewhere (p.57), it seems to be probable that steps were taken to avoid it—until they reached Judaea on the last journey to Jerusalem. It would appear, therefore, that only the Jerusalem appeal will explain these uttermost demands on the disciples' courage and loyalty. But on looking more closely at the first of the sayings, which are rightly conjoined (see p. 70), we may conclude that they were not spoken in Jerusalem itself. For the Aramaic equivalent of the Marcan phrase, *καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι*, would not have been used metaphorically (see in particular the Lucan version of the logion,[1] xiv. 27), with the meaning of 'be my disciple', but only literally in the sense of 'make a journey (issuing in death) in My company'. But, further, it is unlikely that the sayings were uttered when the journey to Jerusalem was actually in progress, since the perils attending the visit to the city would certainly have received some discussion before it was undertaken. Thus, one cannot very well avoid concluding that the sayings would have formed part of a disclosure to the disciples about the nature and implications of the coming appeal in Jerusalem. It seems to be clearly indicated that there is no occasion so fitting as the Confession scene itself.

Verses 34 *and* 35 *imply that Jesus had already announced the Passion.* On the supposition that it misrepresents the purport of the historic event, the report now assumes this shape: after the order of silence came an announcement that, for the future, discipleship would involve the readiness to make a 'pilgrimage of death'. But if our Lord saw death awaiting the disciples in the historical situation which would arise at Jerusalem, and told them so, would any one deny that this was because it awaited Him too? But in that case, is it psychologically comprehensible that He would have addressed the disciples in so disturbing a fashion without having first prepared the way by speaking of the grievous fate which lay in His own path? Surely the serious historical and psycho-

[1] *Ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου, οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής.*

logical difficulties which attend the attempt to dislodge the announcement of the Passion from the Confession scene are good testimony to the trustworthiness of its present setting.

The present position of the second Peter scene is satisfactory. And what shall we say about the setting of the sharp encounter between our Lord and Peter (32 b–33)? The scene implies that something had just happened which had shocked and nonplussed the Apostle; and it is adequately accounted for, if our Lord had just spoken of His *via dolorosa*,[1] thus traversing a passionately-held conception of Messiah's function.

Reasons for accepting the present position of verses 36 *and* 37. At first sight verses 36, 37 may seem to be an intrusion, but in reality it does not require special pleading to incline one to the opposite opinion. For the sayings are congruous in meaning with what preceded them in Mark. Our Lord had been intimating that if the disciples wished to win their way into the Kingdom of God they must first lose their lives in the present age. For them there was no alternative, no less stringent condition. In other words, He had been asking them in effect to adjust their minds to the fact that those earthly hopes which Peter's remonstrance shows that they were entertaining, would never be realized. Instead, if they were to remain His disciples, they must be His allies in Jerusalem, and be ready to die with Him there in the cause of the Kingdom. It is certain that the disciples did not forthwith take our Lord's own point of view and endorse His programme. On the contrary, He asked more of them than they were able to give there and then; and, as may be inferred from Peter's expostulation, a rupture in the relation-

[1] Wendling (p. 116) finds the explanation in the Confession itself. He thinks that originally after verse 29 came the words: καὶ ἐπετίμησεν Πέτρῳ καί λέγει· ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ. In agreement with Wrede, he regards the order of silence as an expression of the editor's peculiar theory of secrecy. It is clear, however, to mention only one objection, that if the order of silence is rightly believed to be historic, Wendling's proposal is untenable.

ship was by no means a remote contingency. May we not consider it to be possible, even probable, that our Lord's answer to their faltering faith was an endeavour to rouse them to the realization of what their now so deep self-committal to His cause involved? They had been admitted to intimate fellowship. They had so identified themselves with Him in the main aim of His career as to undertake a mission as His emissaries. They were aware of the secret of the Messiahship—crudely, inadequately, it is true, but not wholly wrongly. Now therefore (He might very well have said in effect) they were bound by past action and the knowledge which they possessed. If they disowned Him (and a refusal to range themselves alongside Him in a common endeavour, go with Him to Jerusalem, and there surrender all for God's cause, would mean precisely that) they would do so at the cost of the ψυχή. The verses are thus an appeal to the conscience of the disciples in a strain recalling Luke ix. 62 ('No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the Kingdom of God'), &c. Even if, instead of enduring humiliation, shame, and death, they gained the whole world after turning away from Him, what would it profit them at the Judgement? They would have nothing capable of buying back the ψυχή which they would forfeit by their defection.

The full Q parallel to verse 38 *belongs to the Confession scene.* The original, i.e. the Q, form of the eschatological saying which follows (verse 38) is not out of harmony with the body of thought described above. Every member of the company present who confessed allegiance to our Lord (ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἐμοί) at the inevitable legal proceedings in Jerusalem (ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων) would witness the honouring of the bond before the heavenly tribunal. He would acknowledge them as His former allies when at the Judgement He assumed the rôle of 'the Son of man'.

The saying in ix. 1 *is not in its historic context.* There remains the saying in ix. 1. It is obvious that if our Lord told the inner ring of disciples that for them the only way

into the Kingdom of God led through the *ianua mortis*, He could not at the same time have announced that the Kingdom would arrive within their lifetime. If when the saying was uttered only the disciples were present, it is in no way clear how it can be assigned to a later period than the Galilean. If, on the other hand, the ὄχλος was addressed—a quite possible view—one could not, on general grounds, say more for an early than for a late moment in the public ministry, since from first to last our Lord sought to awaken a general conviction that the inauguration of the Kingdom in all its reality and power would not be long delayed. Doubtless we have here an isolated logion. How it found its way into its present position can only be conjectured. Perhaps the oddness of the present grouping is bound up with a problem which could hardly have failed to present itself to the primitive Christian community. Our Lord's words about the fate of the disciples were not verified by the course of events; they did not die with Him at the last; they saved their lives in 'this world' and by so doing (it might have been thought) excluded themselves from 'the world to come'. And yet they had been granted the resurrection experience which must have meant (so the argument would have run) that the fatal decree had been annulled. On this view, the grouping at ix. 1 can be explained with reference to an idea which would have been acceptable to the primitive community: from the time when He called on the disciples to follow Him to death our Lord foreknew that the disciples would fail Him, and was also aware beforehand that He would reinstate them at His resurrection and pledge them anew to life in the Kingdom. Hence the possibility of believing that in one breath He summoned the disciples to a death-journey, and in the next promised them that they should live to see the Kingdom of God.

Summary of conclusions. Only at ix. 1 is the grouping of material in the Marcan account of the Confession scene unhistorical.

The Historic Significance of the Confession Scene

Résumé of the material judged to be historical, and to belong to the Confession.[1] Mark viii. 27–30; an announcement of the Passion and Parousia (Mark viii. 31); the second Peter-scene (Mark viii. 32 b–33); the Q pericope (Matt. x. 34-9 = Luke xii. 51–3, xiv. 26–7, xvii. 33) in which a more primitive account of Mark viii. 34 b–35 was embedded; Mark viii. 36, 37; the Q passage (Matt. x. 32–3 = Luke xii. 8, 9) to which Mark viii. 38 is a mutilated parallel.

Ought the Marcan passage in which the Baptist is identified with the returned Elijah (ix. 11–13) to be added to the above list? M. Loisy (ii, pp. 41–5) thinks that originally the conversation, which he accepts as genuine except for the prediction of suffering, immediately followed the announcement of the Kingdom in ix. 1, itself, in its primitive form, an authentic element of the Confession scene.

We have not accepted M. Loisy's view about the position of ix. 1. But that conclusion would only make a discussion of the primitive setting of the Elijah section unnecessary, if it were obvious that ix. 11–13 must be joined with ix. 1, which however is not the case. The pericope is now linked with verses (9, 10) which cannot be authentic, if we have rightly concluded that our Lord did not predict that He would make a temporary return to earth prior to and distinct from the Parousia. Further, too many difficulties attach to the Transfiguration[2] story to allow one to look for satisfactory help from that quarter in determining the original position of this Elijah pericope. It is better to disregard the present context altogether.

Reasons for assigning the Elijah pericope to the Galilean period. On general grounds, it is not at all easy to understand

[1] Reference should be made to the foregoing discussions regarding the primitive form and the grouping of the passages.

[2] No use is made of the story in this chapter, since on no critically probable view of it would any fresh light be thrown on our main problem.

why the disciples should not have asked the Elijah question at a much earlier moment than Mark represents. One would have thought, indeed, that they would not have taken up the eschatological hope without forthwith becoming curious about the reappearance of the prophet; in which case, what reason could there have been for delay in raising the difficulty? However that may be, in view of the fact that before the Confession the disciples knew that some of the people regarded our Lord as Elijah (viii. 28), it would be a highly singular thing if at some time preceding that occasion they had not asked Him to make their own minds clear on the matter. Of course, if the coming of Elijah was not a vital element of the eschatological programme as they conceived it, their question in ix. 11–13 did not express a personal difficulty, and so it might just as well have been asked at a comparatively late as at an early moment. But in reality the disciples felt a problem. That may safely be inferred from the fact that our Lord had been obliged to solve it for Himself. Besides these considerations there is another objection to the Marcan editor's view that the question was asked so late. How is it conceivable that the disciples could have made up their minds that our Lord was the Messiah and yet have gone on looking for Elijah? Of course, the proper question to ask is, How could the way have lain open to their belief in Him as the Messiah until the Elijah problem had been disposed of? Thus it seems to be clearly indicated that the pericope should be put back into the Galilean period.[1]

The Confession scene occurred near the beginning of the period of the wanderings. According to the present Marcan setting, the Confession scene occurred near the end of the wanderings

[1] Comment should be made on one feature of the pericope, viz., the prediction of suffering (ix. 12 b). This should be eliminated as editorial, since it may certainly be inferred from the sharp encounter between our Lord and Peter in viii. 32 b–33, that the disciples only at the previous moment, i. e. viii. 31, and then for the first time, had been made the recipients of so startling a disclosure.

outside Galilee, when the journey to the capital was about to be undertaken. But that seems to be an error due to the confused and largely unhistorical sequence of events in vi. 45–viii. 27. In one particular, however, Mark is doubtless right. I refer to the close temporal connexion of the Confession with the arrival at Bethsaida (verse 22); but this, it should be remembered, marked the accomplishment of the final withdrawal from Galilee unsuccessfully attempted a day or two before (see pp. 38 f.). One is all the more ready to assign the Confession to the beginning of the wanderings on realizing how strange the question about the popular estimate (27 b–28) is unless it followed quickly on the departure from Galilee. After the mission in the full sense had been in abeyance for some time, our Lord would not have asked what the people amongst whom He had been making His sojourn thought about His person. No opportunity of forming an opinion had been given to them, and so it was certainly not these who were referred to. Doubtless our Lord was thinking of the Galileans, and no reason presents itself which explains why He should only have asked the question after a period of separation from them.

The popular opinions about Jesus. What our Lord's purpose was in asking for the popular view of His person is left unexplained; but it would be strange if it bore no relation to the course of events in Galilee. In view of their important bearing on His intention to renew His appeal elsewhere, He would certainly have sought to make Himself as fully acquainted as possible with all the factors which had led to the crisis. It may be, therefore, that he desired to know with more certainty whether or not a reason for Herod's intervention was the readiness of some of the people of Galilee to regard Him as the Messiah. The disciples, it may be remarked, had had special opportunities of knowing the state of popular opinion, since only a little earlier they had been out on the mission. It seems that they had observed no tendency to ascribe strictly Messianic dignity to our Lord.

The declaration of Peter. So far as we know, Jesus made no comment on the disciples' reply in verse 28, but immediately asked them ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; The question seems to have been intended to pave the way to a discussion touching His person and mission which the crisis in Galilee and the resolve to go to Jerusalem had made an imperative necessity. Certainly our Lord did not interrogate the disciples in this way simply in order to find out what they thought about Him.[1] It is incredible that they could have been His intimate disciples throughout the Galilean period without His being well aware how they regarded Him. It is true of course that the case would be different if their conviction had only just taken shape. Dr. Schweitzer utilizes the Transfiguration story to explain how they came by the knowledge. He thinks that the whole pericope viii. 34–ix. 29 preceded the Confession.[2] It is unwise, however, to put the report of the Transfiguration to that use.[3] If Dr. Schweitzer's theory be set aside as not critically well-founded, it becomes difficult to understand how the disciples' belief can have been a quite recent acquirement. Seeing how our Lord had been thwarted and humiliated in Galilee, would the disciples have believed that He was the Messiah unless, in their own minds at any rate, they had already ascribed that dignity to Him before the hostile forces asserted themselves? It would not, however, be germane to our subject to open out the problem as to when

[1] Spitta thinks that the question meant: 'Wie redet ihr unter dem Volke über mich? nicht aber: für wen haltet ihr mich?' (*Streitfragen*, p. 117; cf. also *Die syn. Grundschrift*, p. 224). This seems to be a very improbable view. To mention only one difficulty: if the disciples whilst they were out on the mission had been telling the people that our Lord was ὁ Χριστός, how is it that the popular ideas about His person were of the kind reported in verse 28 and in Luke ix. 7–9 (cf. Mark vi. 14–16)?

[2] See *The Quest of the Hist. Jesus* (p. 380 f.), and *Das Abendmahl*, vol. ii, p. 58 f.

[3] See, e.g., the discussions of Loisy (vol. i, pp. 93 ff., ii, p. 29 f.); Wellhausen (*Ev. Marci*, p. 69 f.); Pfleiderer (*Primitive Christianity*, vol. ii, p. 39 f.); Carpenter (*The First Three Gospels*, p. 143 f.).

and how the disciples reached their belief; I take leave of it with the remark that at the time of the Confession their conviction doubtless had a history, and probably not a brief one. In that case our Lord would not have been ignorant of what they thought about Him. The real significance, therefore, of the famous scene does not lie in Peter's declaration, Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, but in the sequel to it.

The order of silence. Before proceeding further it is desirable to link the whole Confession incident firmly with history by recognizing that it was occasioned partly by the recent action of Herod and the Pharisees in Galilee, but much more by our Lord's intention to bring His cause to a decision in Jerusalem itself. That enables us to place in its proper perspective the stern order to be silent about the view of His person expressed by Peter. It was a precautionary measure framed with regard to that journey to the capital on which all our Lord's hopes now rested. Additional support for that opinion might be found in the fact that, as far as the public ministry is concerned, the time of the wanderings was unimportant in itself and was intended to be so. Thus the order must mean that the people were not to be led to believe that in going up to the city He was going in the rôle of ὁ Χριστός. Why was Jesus so anxious that the people should not interpret the journey in that way? The explanation (see, e. g., N. Schmidt, *The Prophet of Nazareth*, pp. 30, 277) which rests on the opinion that our Lord did not in any sense connect Himself with the office of Messiah may be set aside. That view undoubtedly rests on an unsatisfactory treatment of the Synoptic data relevant to it and needlessly complicates the problem of our Lord's career. One thing can be said at once, and it is important: our Lord did not regard the order of silence as a means of preventing His foes from compassing His destruction in the city. For besides requiring silence about the Messiahship He announced the Passion. And that suggests that in making the order He was taking steps to ensure that the Messiahship should not be the issue on which He would be

seized and condemned by the authorities. It was on some other issue that He felt called upon to surrender His life; but discussion as to what that issue was must be deferred for the present (see pp. 156–7).

The announcement of the Passion and of the Parousia. After commanding silence, our Lord began to explain to the disciples that He would never take up the rôle of ὁ Χριστός as they conceived it, for a heavy fate awaited Him in Jerusalem. Nevertheless, they had rightly ascribed kingly dignity to Him, only He would not assume it on this side of the cross. A glorious destiny was certainly His, but they must let their thoughts run on another plane if they were to understand it: He would be manifested as 'the Son of Man' shortly after His death. It is true that in the present form of the prediction in viii. 31 the title 'the Son of Man' is used in a sense which probably does not go back to our Lord Himself, but the above remarks are none the less true on that account. For when Jesus spoke of His return after death (doubtless viii. 31 was one of the occasions when He did so) He announced it (it seems to me) in terms of the coming of 'the Son of Man'.

The problem regarding the sense in which our Lord employed the title 'the Son of Man' has already been touched on in the course of the discussion. Here I desire to indicate in a summary fashion what I conceive to have been the nature and significance of the conception as He Himself entertained it.

The historical associations of the title and conception of the Son of Man.

Historically, the title and the ideas which underlie it are rooted in that apocalyptic tradition relating to 'the Son of Man' which found literary embodiment in Dan. vii, Ethiopic Enoch 37–71, and 4 Ezra xiii. There we have evidence that it was expected in certain quarters that at the end of the age a pre-existent supernatural being would be 'mani-

fested' as the judge and ruler of the world. The fullest delineation of the character and function of that figure is to be found in the Enoch source.[1] There he appears under various designations: 'the Righteous One', 'the Elect One', 'His (i. e. God's) Anointed', 'the Son of Man'.

[1] The date of Enoch 37–71 (the so-called 'Similitudes') is most probably pre-Christian. (Dr. Charles decides on 94–79 B. C.) Some scholars suspect interpolations by Christian hands. Thus N. Schmidt supposes that several editors have annotated and made large editions to a work in which originally God alone was the Judge and there was no Messiah (*The Prophet of Nazareth*, p. 85). But Schmidt's reasons for this conclusion, so far as they are disclosed, are not impressive, and his is not the prevailing view.

There has also been dispute as to whether in the original form of the 'Similitudes' the expression 'the Son of Man' was a personal designation or merely descriptive. In xlvi. 1 the supernatural being in question is described as 'one whose countenance had the appearance of a man'. Since, with the exception of four instances (xlvi. 3, lxii. 7, lxix. 27, lxxi. 14), the phrase is always preceded by a demonstrative pronoun—'this' or 'that' Son of Man—some scholars have urged that the author was not using a title but was constantly referring back to the figure described in xlvi. 1 as being 'like a man'. But this argument seems in reality to have little weight. Nearly all who have worked on Enoch agree that the extant Ethiopic text of the 'Similitudes' is a translation of a lost Greek text, itself a rendering of an original Semitic work. Now Ethiopic has no definite article, and could, and frequently does, make use of a demonstrative pronoun in its place. Thus it may very well be that the Greek text employed the phrase *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* throughout as a literal translation of an original Semitic expression בר נש(א) (or בן האדם). [This conclusion, in Dr. Charles's opinion, is not rendered doubtful by the fact that the Ethiopic text has three different expressions for 'Son of Man'. See *The Book of Enoch*, p. 86.] Significant corroboration of that view comes from the Gizeh fragments of the Greek version (cf. viii. 42–9, where, of twelve instances of the use of the Ethiopic demonstrative, eleven are found to correspond to the Greek article. See Charles, pp. 195–9). Again, within the 'Similitudes' themselves are instances where the demonstrative clearly represents the definite article, e. g. lii. 5, lxii. 10, lxxi. 13, where a demonstrative precedes 'angel of peace', 'Lord of Spirits', 'Head of Days'. To these considerations should be added the evidence of the four passages in which the expression 'the Son of Man' is used without qualification. Finally it may be argued that the writer's purpose was first to describe the external appearance of the two figures whom he had seen in his vision and afterwards to apply to them personal designations in terms of the introductory descriptions. Thus God

The Importance of the Linguistic Question.

A proposed solution of the problem raised by the frequent occurrence of the title ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in the Gospels must take into account the findings of a recent period of research regarding the Aramaic basis of the Greek title. To put the matter very briefly (for the necessary citations from the original Aramaic sources see especially Fiebig's *Der Menschensohn*, 1901), ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is best regarded as a literal translation of the Aramaic בר נש(א). This expression is known to have meant 'man' (singular and collective), 'a man', 'some one'. It is necessary to remember, however, that it is not possible to speak with certainty about Aramaic idiom in our Lord's day, since no Aramaic material which is of value for the question at issue has been handed down from the period second century B. C. to second century A. D. However, בר נש(א) is a common expression for 'man', 'a man', in the Talmud of Jerusalem,[1] which is a witness for Galilean Aramaic.

In view of the normal meaning of בר נש(א), Lietzmann, Wellhausen, N. Schmidt, and others concluded in effect that our Lord could not have used it as a Messianic self-designation. But that is an arbitrary and unacceptable proposal. The Synoptic Gospels themselves are based on Aramaic sources, and yet the Evangelists were able to understand בר נש(א) messianically; if they could do so, why not also our Lord? But although it is easy to exaggerate the linguistic difficulty, yet the discussion from that side has rendered real service by

was described as 'One who had a head of days', and was subsequently referred to as 'the Head of Days'. Similarly, the other figure was introduced as one 'whose countenance had the appearance of a man', and afterwards received the title 'the Son of Man', or rather, to be idiomatic, 'the Man'.

It appears, therefore, that shortly before the Christian era the expression 'the Man' was already familiar in certain circles, probably small, as a title of the Enochic figure; in which case one of the objections sometimes urged against the theory that our Lord associated Himself with that figure falls to the ground.

[1] Three instances occur in sayings attributed to Rabbis of the second century A. D. See Shĕqālim, v. 6; Bĕrākôth, i. 5; Nĕdārîm, vii. 1.

leaving little room for doubt that there are instances in the Gospels where ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is a mistaken rendering of בר נש(א). I mention the cases of that kind below.

'Son of Man' Sayings in which the Title is either a Mistranslation or an Interpolation.

Mark ii. 28 (= Matt. xii. 8, Luke vi. 5) and Matt. xii. 31–2 (= Luke xii. 10) are clear cases of mistranslation of בר נש(א).

The instance in Mark ii. 10 (Matt. ix. 6, Luke v. 24) is also not infrequently explained in the same way; but if what has already been said about the secondary features of the pericope is right (see pp. 12–14), that view is unnecessary.

Matt. xii. 40 (three days and three nights in the heart of the earth) is doubtless an editorial comment; and similarly the Lucan parallel (a sign to this generation, xi. 30).[1]

Matt. xiii. 32 ('He who sows the good seed is the Son of Man') belongs to the explanation of the Parable of the Tares (itself peculiar to Matt.) and is not therefore likely to be authentic (see, e. g., J. Weiss, *Die Schriften*, pp. 311–12).

The words ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in Luke vi. 22 are paralleled in Matt. (v. 11) by ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, which Harnack (*The Sayings of Jesus*, Eng. trans., pp. 51–3) thinks should be removed on textual grounds. In that case, the title did not occur in the Q passage. The significance of this Lucan insertion is not to be overlooked: it shows that it is necessary to be on the look out for projections of the title into the sources.

In Matt. viii. 20 = Luke ix. 58 (foxes have holes) and xi. 19 = Luke vii. 34 (eating and drinking) our Lord is reported, on the authority of Q, to have used the self-appellation in non-eschatological connexions. The Matthaean editor assigns

[1] I hold that our Lord spoke of 'the sign of יוֹנָה', i. e. not 'Jonah' but 'John'. The mistranslation occurred owing to the close proximity in Aramaic Q of the reference to Jonah (יוֹנָה) and the Ninevites. For the linguistic possibility of this view, see Cheyne and Schmiedel in *Encycl. Bib.* (col. 2502, 2505), and J. H. Michael's article in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, January 1920.

the former to a fairly early stage in the Galilean ministry, the Lucan to the time of the last journey; but in reality it is far better suited to the period of the wanderings. It is not easy to conceive that Jesus would have had nowhere to lay His head in Galilee. And again, the 'whithersoever thou goest', whilst it well suits the time when our Lord was moving about outside Galilee in an apparently aimless fashion, is ill-adapted to a southward journey near Passover, when no one would have been in doubt about His destination. Now, having regard to the fact that after leaving Galilee (see pp. 88–9) He was so deeply concerned that no one outside the company of the disciples should think of Him as ὁ Χριστός (Mark viii. 30), it would surely have been an extraordinary thing, to say the least, if He had openly used 'בר נש(א)' as a self-designation, thus being indifferent to the risk that He might be understood to mean that later on He would become world-judge and world-ruler. It was noticed above that the editors felt free on occasion to project 'the title into the sources; and we may reasonably conclude that this is what has happened in the present instance. Originally the personal pronoun 'I' would have been used.

We have examined enough passages to make it apparent that בר נש(א) could be both interpolated into the sources and mistranslated. In view of these known tendencies and of the fact that when the necessary corrections are made we see the non-eschatological applications of the title disappearing, it is not an arbitrary procedure to regard the occurrence in Matt. xi. 19 = Luke vii. 34 ('eating and drinking') as representing a usage which arose and became current in the early Christian community. Mark ix. 9 (till the Son of Man had risen from the dead) = Matt. xvii. 9 is doubtless secondary (see p. 87). Luke xix. 10 (to seek and to save) is reminiscent of Ezekiel xxxiv. 16. This is one of the passages in the Gospels which Völter (*Die Menschensohnfrage*, 1916, p. 30) presses into the service of his theory that our Lord derived His conception of Himself as 'the Son of Man' from

the book of Ezekiel. In working out his view, Völter was obliged to treat the eschatological 'Son of Man' passages as interpolations. It seems to the present writer that when the sayings which are attributed to our Lord are critically examined in detail, no foundation remains for that presentment of the case. Doubtless the use of the title in xix. 10 is unauthentic.

Finally, it is not certain whether Luke xxii. 48 ('betrayest thou (א)בר נש with a kiss?') goes back to our Lord (Matt. has ἐφ' ὃ πάρει, and in Mark, Judas is not spoken to); if it does, we must, in agreement with N. Schmidt (*The Prophet of Nazareth*, p. 123), allow the probability that originally the saying was 'Betrayest thou a man[1] with a kiss?'

If any 'Son of Man' utterances go back to our Lord, they are to be looked for amongst Parousia passages.

The remaining 'Son of Man' sayings (they form the greater part of those reported in the Synoptic Gospels) relate to the Passion, Resurrection, and Parousia. As regards the announcements of the Passion and Resurrection, I have already urged that it was not in the rôle of 'the Son of Man' that our Lord undertook the death-journey to Jerusalem (see pp. 77–8); and further, that He did not lead His disciples to anticipate His Resurrection (see pp. 78–80). Accordingly, if there are any instances in the Gospels which preserve the sense in which our Lord Himself used the title, they are to be looked for in Parousia passages.

'Son of Man' sayings were not uttered during the Galilean period.

No 'Son of Man' saying, it seems to me, can be assigned with probability to the Galilean period of the ministry.

[1] Fiebig shows that (א)בר נש could be in the *status emphaticus* in form without necessarily being so in meaning (cf. *Der Menschensohn*, p. 124).

Having regard to what has already been said on the question, this assertion requires defence only in respect of Matt. x. 23. It is provided by the Confession scene. Peter's cry, σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, shows that Matt. x. 23 formed no part of the charge to the Twelve. For, in the first place, it is apparent from the Confession scene as a whole that by ὁ Χριστός Peter did not mean 'the Son of Man'. That is just what he ought to have meant if at Matt. x. 23 our Lord had identified Himself with that figure. And again, Peter would not have called our Lord ὁ Χριστός if at Matt. x. 23 he had understood that He was speaking of a figure other than Himself.

Grounds for believing that our Lord expected to return in the rôle of 'the Son of Man'

It has been supposed by certain critics that 'through the Greek translation of the Synoptic Apocalypse it [i. e. the title] may have found its way as a Messianic title into the Greek Gospels' (N. Schmidt, *The Prophet of Nazareth*, p. 105. Cf. also Wellhausen on Mark xiii. 26 in *Ev. Marci*, p. 105). But this proposal does not agree with the evidence of Q. In that source, which is doubtless earlier[1] than the Synoptic Apocalypse, seven instances of the use of the title are found, some being eschatological applications, others not so. On the above hypothesis, the former must have been interpolated into Q after it was compiled, but before Matthew and Luke made use of it. That complication alone creates an unfavourable impression. But what seems to be a fatal objection arises from the presence of non-eschatological 'Son of Man' sayings in Q. If these were in Q when the others found their way into that source, (א)בר נש had already been 'Christianized'. If, on the other hand, they were not yet in Q, there must have been fresh interpolations, later than the first but prior to the employment

[1] For the origin and date of the Synoptic Apocalypse see Moffatt, *Introd. to Lit. of N.T.*, pp. 207–9; Streeter, *Oxford Studies in the Syn. Problem*, pp. 179 ff.

of Q by Matthew and Luke. That is to ask too much. Doubtless the 'Son of Man' sayings which are now found in the Synoptic Apocalypse were either interpolated into it by its Christian editor, or, if they were an integral element of that work, are to be regarded as a further expression of the tradition about 'the Man' in Daniel, Eth. Enoch, and 4 Ezra. In the latter case, the presence of the title in this originally Jewish document would have rendered all the more easy the incorporation in the Gospels of the whole of this small apocalypse.

The rejection of the above sceptical hypothesis does not mean, however, that all the 'Son of Man' sayings relating to the Parousia should be retained; on the contrary, critical difficulties, usually insuperable, attach to a considerable proportion of them (but by no means to all), as a glance at a 'Synopsis' and an appreciation of the tendency, which is most marked in Matthew, to heighten the eschatological colouring of sayings, will show.

Now in order to believe that our Lord applied to Himself the apocalyptic conception of 'the Man', and that He spoke of His return in terms of it, we need not rest the whole weight of the case merely on the fact that some sayings will bear critical examination. There is also a reason of a different character. Few things may be so unhesitatingly affirmed as that the crisis in Galilee and the decision to go to Jerusalem made the Messiahship a problem of vital importance for our Lord. He had acknowledged to Himself now that in prosecuting the mission further He would be pressing on to death, that His earthly career would end before the present age had been 'wound up'; how, then, was He to conceive His Messiahship? Under the pressure of stern facts He would have felt the necessity either of severing Himself from the office of Messiah, or of affirming His connexion with it in a way capable of reconciliation with coming suffering and death. There ready for His use lay the apocalyptic conception of 'the Man'; and a critical examination of the Synoptics and

general considerations alike indicate that He took it up and settled the problem of His Messiahship in close dependence on it. In brief, here is the form in which our Lord's Messianic consciousness found expression when the cross came definitely into sight. First the *ianua mortis*, then the return in glory as 'the Man'!

The second Peter scene. Peter's rebuke of the Lord now hardly requires comment. Being unable for the present to grasp the new doctrine that our Lord would be ὁ Χριστός in the sense of the Daniel-Enoch tradition, he saw in the announcement of coming suffering and death the undermining of his passionate hope that he had been following one who would lead him into the Kingdom of God.

The announcement of the fate of the intimate disciples (Matt. x. 34–9, Luke xii. 51 f., xiv. 26 f., xvii. 33). It was suggested that this material should be transferred to the Confession scene on the ground that its present localizations are artificial, that two of the verses (i. e. bearing the cross, losing and preserving life) ought not to be removed from their Marcan setting (viii. 34, 35), and that the rest appear to be 'all of a piece' with them.

As regards the purport of the section, little remains to be added to what was said when the present context of the sayings about the cross and preserving and losing life came under consideration.[1] No more in His words about family feuds than in those about the σταυρός is it necessary to suppose that our Lord was led by a dogmatic conception—as if He had said that the disciples must expect family strife and death at the outbreak of the 'Woes of the Messiah'. These intimate followers had just heard the announcement of the Passion, and its consequences for themselves as men of earthly affections and loyalties were pressing hard upon them. In words recalling Micah's account of the social conditions of his day, our Lord informed them in effect that it was inevitable that His work should sunder members of families from one

[1] See pp. 81-3.

another; and He summoned them to the final severance by intimating that if they put the ties of family life above those which bound them to Himself they could not remain His disciples, nor could they ever see the Kingdom of God.

The sayings in Mark viii. 36, 37, and Matt. x. 32–3 = Luke xii. 8, 9 (cf. Mark viii. 38) have already been sufficiently discussed (pp. 84–6).

Jesus demanded martyrdom only from the intimate disciples. The bearing of that conclusion on His purpose in going to Jerusalem. I conclude this chapter by a further reference to a point of much importance. If it be maintained that Mark (viii. 34 a) rightly represents that our Lord summoned not only the disciples but the ὄχλος as well to accompany Him to Jerusalem and to travel with Him the dark path of suffering and death, then we are to understand that in reaffirming His conception of His mission after Galilee He came to realize that μετάνοια was no longer sufficient for entry into the coming Kingdom; martyrdom was now required. In that case, this definite conclusion may be framed: our Lord did not go to Jerusalem in order to spread the movement of repentance inaugurated by the Baptist. That earlier purpose, pursued in Galilee, was now abandoned. In reality, however, there is ample reason for rejecting the Marcan reference to the ὄχλος as editorial (see pp. 65–6). Our Lord was addressing only His intimate followers; and we are not entitled to extend the sphere of reference beyond them. So far then as the evidence which has yet come before us is concerned, the way remains open for us to suppose that Jesus intended in Jerusalem still to force on the movement of repentance, partly by teaching, but also by the appeal from the Cross.

III

ON THE WAY TO JERUSALEM

The limits of the discussion in the present chapter. It will be convenient if in this chapter we confine our attention to material which falls prior to the entry into Jerusalem. And the discussion may be limited to such incidents or teaching as have a material bearing on two questions: do the disclosures which our Lord made to the disciples at the Confession scene still hold good? And do any of the incidents which belong to the journey further illuminate its purpose? It would be desirable in any case to ask these questions, since some time elapsed between the Confession scene and the commencement of the journey.

The broad features of the material. In their present form the sources relating to the short period covered by the journey are unambiguous on a point of primary importance: as at the Confession scene, so now as He goes to force on the decisive issue in Jerusalem itself, our Lord was fully persuaded that He would die in the city. But the sources certainly do not represent that He went 'solely in order to die'. They indicate rather that the Galilean conception as to the means whereby the mission ought to be prosecuted had by no means been entirely discarded, for He taught in public ὡς εἰώθει (Mark x. 1). But further, Mark (and Matthew) tells us that the surrender of His life would be a profoundly purposeful act; He would yield it up as a λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν. As for the special material in Luke ix. 51–xviii. 14, which purports to belong to the last journey, although the λύτρον conception is absent, here Jesus tells the disciples that He must submit Himself to a baptism of death (xii. 50).

Let us, however, turn to details.

The commencement of the journey. In Mark the journey begins at ix. 30. Here it is intimated that our Lord set out with the disciples from somewhere near the locality of the transfiguration (κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντες κτλ.). But that geographical note should be ignored; otherwise, according to the present Marcan sequence of events, the Confession scene would belong to the close of the period of the wanderings (see pp. 88-9).

The avoidance of publicity in Galilee. Mark goes on to say that our Lord passed through Galilee on the southward journey, but *incognito* (καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ). He then explains why He avoided publicity: He was instructing His disciples about His death and resurrection. The redactor says that they remained in ignorance of the significance of our Lord's words and were afraid to ask for enlightenment. Matthew xvii. 22 ff., and Luke ix. 43 ff., on the other hand, do not say that the passage through Galilee was made in secrecy; but it ought not on that account to be thought that Mark's testimony on that point is not worthy of trust. The Matthaean editor seems to have disliked the idea of secrecy,[1] and so to have remodelled his Marcan source, introducing in the process the somewhat obscure συστρεφομένων δὲ αὐτῶν κτλ. Or perhaps in this case he felt that the remark was incompatible with the story about the yearly temple-tax which he intended to hook on to the Marcan report (ix. 33) of the visit to Capernaum. As for Luke, he may very well have felt that he could not make use of the Marcan κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντες παρεπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, since this indicated that the journey to the city was already in progress, whereas he intended to make it commence a little farther on in his story (i. e. at ix. 51), drawing on his special material for the purpose. In that case he naturally passed by the remark about the privacy. So far, then, as Matthew and Luke are

[1] Cf. his treatment of Mark vii. 24, vi. 48 (Allen, *Matthew*, p. 190). It may be remarked, however, that Matthew does not represent that our Lord resumed the public ministry during his last visit to Galilee.

concerned, it seems that we may accept Mark's testimony about the secrecy of the journey through Galilee. But further, there is nothing which suggests what motive the Marcan editor might have had for introducing this important detail into the report; doubtless it may be accepted. It is not at that point that a secondary feature should be discerned, but in the explanation which is offered of our Lord's desire.

The reason for the secrecy in Galilee. It was urged at an earlier stage (see pp. 32–4) that Jesus desired to avoid coming under the notice of Antipas, lest the hopes which were drawing Him to Jerusalem should be ruined. As for the present form of the prediction[1] of the Passion and Resurrection, it lies open to the objections raised against the first announcement in viii. 31. It may well be, however, that behind it there lies a genuine historical reminiscence to the effect that in passing through Galilee our Lord spoke of His death and parousia in terms of the coming of the 'Son of Man'. If that be so, it is likely enough, judging from what we know of their anticipations at the time of the Confession, that the disciples were still unable to take our Lord's standpoint in sympathetic understanding, and that, perhaps remembering the second Peter-scene, they shrank from opening up the question afresh.[2] From this, as well as from the Confession scene, it would appear that the disciples accompanied our Lord to Jerusalem without the strong support of an inner endorsement of His proposals. If that be so, one can the more readily understand their conduct at the end.[3] And, moreover, one can regard as a *non-sequitur* the argument of

[1] Luke (ix. 44) shortens the Marcan form, making no explicit reference to death and resurrection—perhaps because this seemed unnecessary so soon after ix. 22.

[2] By substituting *καὶ ἐλυπήθησαν σφόδρα*, Matthew here, as so often (cf. the Marcan parallels to viii. 26, xiii. 16, xiv. 33, xvi. 9, &c.), softens a statement derogatory to the disciples. Luke amplifies Mark so as to make it appear that their ignorance was due to divine action (cf. xviii. 34, xxiv. 16).

[3] I suggest farther on (p. 151) that the flight of the disciples may have been sanctioned by our Lord after the betrayal by Judas.

Pfleiderer and others to the effect that 'their complete surprise at the catastrophe' [this is wrong, in my opinion] 'and their flight when Jesus was arrested . . . makes the impression that He journeyed thither, not in order to die, but to fight and conquer, and that in looking forward to the conflict His own death presented itself not as a certainty, but at the most as a possibility, much as in the case of a general on the eve of a decisive battle, or of Luther on the way to Worms' (*Primitive Christianity*, vol. ii, pp. 34–5).

Mark reports that after the (apparently brief) sojourn at Capernaum (ix. 33 f.) our Lord passed on to the south (x. 1 = Matt. xix. 1). Here, before Jericho had been reached (x. 46), He reverted to His custom of teaching[1] the ὄχλος, who were presumably Passover-pilgrims, some perhaps being former Galilean adherents.

Reasons for ignoring, for the most part, the so-called travel-narrative of Luke (ix. 51–xviii. 14). At a little earlier point in Mark (namely, at ix. 40) the Lucan sequence of material becomes independent, the Marcan not being picked up again until xviii. 15 (= Mark x. 13). In these chapters Luke relates what he represents to have been incidents of the last journey. It would not be difficult to make it probable that 'the setting and the juxtaposition of the contents [of these chapters] are topical and literary, not chronological' (Moffatt, *Introd. to Lit. of N. T.*, p. 273). As it does not seem to me that an attempt to determine what parts might belong to the period of the journey would lead to a better understanding of our Lord's purpose in making it, I abstain from the task. One[2] passage, however, from this section of Luke must not be passed by; it is xii. 49–50,[3] which now lies conjoined with Q material relating to domestic feuds (verses 51–3 = Matt. x. 34–6).

[1] As in xiv. 14 and xxi. 14, so here in xix. 2, Matthew substitutes 'healing' for Mark's 'teaching'.

[2] The important passages, xii. 8, 9, xiii. 31–3, xvii. 33, have already been considered (see pp. 29 f., 68, 71, 81 f., 85).

[3] Πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη. βάπτισμα δὲ ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι, καὶ πῶς συνέχομαι ἕως ὅτου τελεσθῇ.

The purport of Luke xii. 49–50. Πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν is commonly interpreted with reference to διαμερισμός (verse 51). But it is not probable that Luke has here preserved an historical grouping. In the first place, it is not clear why Matthew should have omitted verses 49, 50, if Q contained them in the present Lucan setting; they would not, indeed, belong to Q at all on the usual view of that source. Again, it is difficult to see what satisfactory explanation is forthcoming from διαμερισμός, if, as is often suggested, verse 49 should be translated as follows: 'I came to cast fire on the earth, and what do I wish (i. e. what more do I desire) if it is already kindled (καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη;)?' In that case our Lord was voicing not His own opinion but that of the disciples, who, one must understand, were objecting to some proposed course or other which seemed to them to be unnecessary. Now this way of looking at the matter might lead to an explanation if it could be said that διαμερισμός was understood by the disciples to be a feature of the 'Woes of the Messiah'[1] (חבלי המשיח), for then they might have meant this: the 'Woes' have begun; the End will not now tarry; wherein, then, lies the necessity for the death-journey to Jerusalem? But verse 51[2] does not agree with that presentment of the case; for from that verse it appears that the disciples thought that our Lord had come to give peace on the earth, not διαμερισμός; and also that they did not welcome the διαμερισμός, which they would have done if they had connected it with the 'Woes' or 'Pangs' of the Messiah. Now the difficulty becomes obvious: if the disciples did not interpret the διαμερισμός in this dogmatic fashion, how could they have been questioning on the basis of the existence of domestic feuds, not vitally connected in their minds with the End, as to what more our Lord could desire?

[1] Cf. Jubilees xxiii. 13 f.; 2 Baruch xxvii. 2–5, xlviii. 32 f., lxx. 2 f.; 4 Ezra v. 9, vi. 24.

[2] Δοκεῖτε ὅτι εἰρήνην παρεγενόμην δοῦναι ἐν τῇ γῇ; οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ἢ διαμερισμόν.

Is the case any better if καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη be translated 'and how I wish it had already been kindled'.[1] On this view our Lord gave expression to a longing of His own that the fire of διαμερισμός were already burning. But this, too, is not easily reconciled with verse 51, the natural implication of which is that our Lord's work had already started family feuds, which were disagreeable to the disciples because they thought that He had come to give peace on earth. That, however, will not do, for, *ex hypothesi*, διαμερισμός had not yet commenced.

Or, again, it may be that verses 51 f. reflect something like an inner collapse on the part of the disciples as they envisaged the consequences of the Jerusalem proposal. They were realizing that members of families would be sundered from one another and that they themselves were to break their earthly ties; and that was unpalatable, for was it not peace that He had come to give? If that be so, then verse 49 means that our Lord told them that they must reconcile themselves to the fact that the fire of διαμερισμός would break out. It was part of His mission to kindle it. Would that it were already burning! However, it would not be kindled until after His baptism of death (verse 50). Now that would mean that our Lord thought that the 'Woes of the Messiah', of which domestic strife was expected to be part, must precede the coming of the Kingdom. If it could be shown that that really was His expectation, the view just put forward might be seriously entertained. But the theory that He looked for the outbreak of the 'Woes' is in need of proof, and it is not clear how the proof is to be offered. Thus it is not probable that those parts of the Synoptic Apocalypse which indicate that He shared this apocalyptic expectation ever fell from His own lips.[2] Again, Luke xvii. 20, 21 appears to point the

[1] For examples of exclamatory τί = 'how' cf. Robertson, *Grammar of Greek New Testament*, pp. 739, 1176. As instances of εἰ after θέλω Holtzmann (HZNT, p. 502) cites Isa. ix. 4 f., Sirach, xxiii. 14.

[2] See Canon Streeter, *Oxford Studies in the Syn. Problem*, pp. 179 ff.

other way. Further, if He did expect the 'Woes', it is an extraordinary thing that at the time of this incident (which, as verse 50 shows, was not earlier than the Confession scene) the disciples should have been unaware of the fact, which they obviously were.

Conclusion about Luke xii. 49, 50. In view of the several difficulties noticed above, it is desirable that the connexion of verses 49, 50 with διαμερισμός should be rejected as unhistorical, and that πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν κτλ. be related to the Judgement. Jesus, it seems to me, meant that after the baptism of death He would cast the fire of judgement on the earth. Would that the baptism were accomplished and the fire kindled! This explanation acquires additional force from the fact that it is in harmony with our Lord's expectation about His return in the rôle of the Son of Man. As for the nature of the relationship between the two events (His death and parousia) one may not, on the basis of the present passage, assert more than temporal sequence. If in our Lord's mind there was also a causal connexion, His death being thought of as a condition of the arrival of the Judgement, it is not indicated here.

The promise to the disciples (*Mark* x. 29 f.) *of earthly rewards in the present age is either unhistorical or post-dated.* In the latter part of the Marcan (and Lucan) pericope on the danger of riches (Mark x. 17–31; Matt. xix. 16–30; Luke xviii. 18–30) is matter for comment. The words Ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα καὶ ἠκολουθήκαμέν σοι (verse 28, Matt. xix. 27, Luke xviii. 28), in their present position, refer to the disciples' renunciation of earthly values and their acceptance of the prospect of death in Jerusalem. But if the position of verses 28 f. is anything like correct, our Lord's reply has been revised and adapted to the situation and mood of the early Christian community. For it is reported that He promised the disciples that they would reap the rewards of their fidelity and sacrifice 'in this time' (Mark x. 30, Luke xviii. 30), as well as obtain eternal life in the age to come. If,

however, ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ be considered historic, verses 28 f. cannot belong to a later period than the Galilean; indeed it would seem that the whole pericope (verses 17–31) now falls too late. Whichever view be adopted, it is not permissible to say, on the basis of 28 f., that our Lord's anticipations for the disciples, at the time when the journey to Jerusalem was actually in progress, were radically different from what they were at the Confession scene. Elsewhere on the journey Mark gives no hint of a changed outlook on our Lord's part as regards the fate of the disciples. On the contrary, the report of the reply to the request of the sons of Zebedee (x. 38 f.) comes into line with the announcement made at the Confession scene.

It is to be noticed that the account given by the Matthaean editor is not open to the objection raised against the Marcan. He relates that our Lord promised the disciples that their reward should be twelve thrones ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ (xix. 28). He then falls back on Mark and adds characteristic earthly blessings as well, which were not, however, to be received in the present age. The historical nucleus of this material in Matt. xix. 28 probably does not extend beyond the promise of the thrones. For the remainder the editor seems to have drawn on current conceptions touching the renewal of the world after the appearance of the Messiah (see McNeile's note, *St. Matthew*, p. 281), and apparently also on Ethiopic Enoch (cf. lxii. 5). In Luke (xxii. 30) the words about the thrones form part of our Lord's discourse at the Last Supper, and we may postpone further comment.

The prediction of the Passion and Resurrection in Mark x. 33 f. No fresh light is thrown on the problem before us by the prediction of the Passion and Resurrection in Mark x. 33 f. (Matt. xx. 18 f.; Luke xviii. 31 f.). Like the others, this in its present form is a *post-eventum* editing; but unless our earlier discussion was seriously at fault, the contention that our Lord was fully persuaded that His Passion would precede the accomplishment of the aims of His mission is not on that account weakened.

The λύτρον passage. In a famous Marcan passage (x. 35–45, Matt. xx. 20–28, cf. Luke xxii. 24–7) our Lord is reported to have made a further allusion to His Passion, and to have pronounced on the effect in regard to the mission which He expected to flow therefrom: He had come δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλων. We shall, however, be in a better position to discuss the utterance at a later stage (see pp. 152–3).

The Bartimaeus episode does not imply that our Lord regarded Himself as 'the Son of David' and openly accepted the title. Let us now pass on to the story of Bartimaeus (Mark x. 46–52, Matt. xx. 29–34, Mark xviii. 35–43). As our Lord, with the disciples and a considerable crowd of people, was leaving Jericho, He is said to have been addressed by this suppliant for mercy as υἱὲ Δαυείδ (similarly Matthew and Luke). The Messiah was commonly expected to spring from the line of David, and the expression 'the Son of David' had become a technical title for him.[1] Are we here being asked to believe that near the end of His life our Lord held and, in effect, publicly admitted that He was the Davidic Messiah? This question will come before us again as the discussion proceeds. At this juncture we will indicate only one or two objections to an affirmative answer.

At the Confession scene, where He discussed with the disciples the fundamental issues touching His person and historic mission, our Lord declared that He would be manifested as 'the Son of Man'. But 'the Son of Man' was not the Davidic Messiah. Thus, if the usual interpretation of the Bartimaeus episode is right, it is not merely a question, as is so often supposed, of reserve about the Messiahship being cast away as the crisis in our Lord's career becomes imminent, but also of an extraordinary change in His conception of His person, and also, it should be added, of His rôle.

[1] Cf. 'Raise up unto them their King, the Son of David', Ps. of Sol. xvii. 22.

Is it the case, however, that the story presses these problems into our hands in a serious way? Consider the order of silence (καὶ ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ πολλοὶ ἵνα σιωπήσῃ). The explanation which would make it simply an expression of the annoyance of our Lord's companions at the beggar's importunity is forced[1] and unlikely. It is purely conjectural that many of those present regarded Bartimaeus as a nuisance; and even if they did, it is improbable, in view of our Lord's known reputation as a healer and His readiness (as the story shows) still to heal, that they would have ventured to intervene. It seems, therefore, that the attempt to silence Bartimaeus was made because he had hailed our Lord as the Davidic Messiah. Now, to argue for a moment on quite general grounds, the order of silence may have been due to the fact that the crowd entertained the belief that our Lord was the Davidic Messiah, but did not want wider publicity to be given to it. Or, on the other hand, they may have acted as they did because they did not associate Him with the Davidic Messiahship. The probabilities of the case do not at all favour the former alternative. It would be an extraordinary thing if the crowd had held that our Lord was 'the Son of David' and yet had felt it necessary to preserve secrecy. Why should they have done so, unless He had laid them under command? To say nothing of the grave difficulties which attach to the subject-matter (Davidic Messiahship) of the secrecy, the Messiahship, on that hypothesis, is a secret and yet not a secret; the ὄχλος is somehow in possession of it, but it is not to become public! There is also the further difficulty that the testimony of the sources is directly controverted in regard to the popular views about our Lord's person (Mark viii. 27 f.) at the end of the Galilean ministry. On considering the latter alternative, however, we are confronted with no such improbabilities as those just mentioned. The Messianic implications of Bartimaeus' cry, which on this view was no more than a guess, or

[1] In disagreement with Schweitzer (p. 394), Loisy (ii, p. 251), Lagrange (*Saint Marc*, p. 267), and others.

perhaps an inference[1] of the kind which seems to have been made in Galilee (see pp. 75–6 n.), were not endorsed by those in our Lord's company, and so he was sternly told to be quiet. It may not therefore be inferred from the report that our Lord healed the man that He accepted the Messianic title, 'the Son of David'. On the contrary, as those about Him did not think that He was the Davidic Messiah, and had shown their disapproval of Bartimaeus' use of the title in no uncertain way, He was free to render the desired ministration without conceding by implication that He regarded Himself as 'the Son of David'.

Summary of Conclusions

It results from our discussion down to this stage that we may not suppose that Jesus went to Jerusalem with the expectation of assuming there the office of the Davidic Messiah. This view is no mere *argumentum e silentio.* It rests on the Confession scene and on the Bartimaeus episode, and is clearly indicated by His expectation of the Passion. His thoughts about His Messiahship were running in another direction: at the great *dénouement,* which would take place later on after His approaching death, He would enter on the rôle of 'the Son of Man'. In order to accomplish His life's purpose, Jesus had deliberately chosen to utilize the conditions offered by Jerusalem at Passover. As regards this purpose, we have not noticed any occasion for thinking that He may have conceived it differently from what He did in Galilee: He intended to force on a widespread movement of repentance in preparation for the coming Kingdom.[2]

By what means may we hold that He was expecting, at this part of his career, to secure this volume of repentance? To

[1] Perhaps facilitated in this instance by expectations resting on Isa. xxix. 18, xxxv. 5.

[2] On pp. 152–3 I urge that this conclusion is unaffected by the λύτρον saying.

me it seems to be clear that our Lord recognized that it could not be obtained apart from His death. In other words, He regarded His Passion as necessary in the sense that repentance on the desired scale could not be secured without it.

If in drawing the above conclusion we are near to our Lord's mind, this should be allowed: He considered that the concrete issue between Himself and His opponents, of which, speaking historically, the Passion would be the outcome, would be of vital importance for the accomplishment of His purpose in the city. He would, I think, have reckoned it a necessity that the issue should be of such a kind that, as the result of His being brought down to death upon it, His countrymen would be moved to repentance. Apart from this key to the significance of the events of the Jerusalem period, discussion cannot be satisfactory, but with its aid much becomes clear.

In endeavouring to feel our way through the difficulties which are raised by incidents of the Jerusalem appeal, we must also make due allowance for the fact that the disciples accompanied our Lord to the city under the shadow of the knowledge that a heavy fate awaited them there. They had espoused the cause of the Kingdom in a more decisive fashion than others, and now accordingly they were required to meet its severer demands.

IV

THE FINAL APPEAL

§ 1. *The Entry into Jerusalem*

Statement of the chief pericopes to be discussed. The Entry into Jerusalem (Mark xi. 1–10, Matt. xxi. 1–9, Luke xix. 26–8); the Purification of the Temple (Mark xi. 15–19, Matt. xxi. 12–13, Luke xix. 45–6); the Question about Authority (Mark xi. 27–33, Matt. xxi. 23–7, Luke xx. 1–8); the Husbandmen and the Heir (Mark xii. 1–12, Matt. xxi. 33–48, Luke xx. 9–19); the Tribute Money (Mark xii. 13–17, Matt. xxii. 15–22, Luke xx. 20–6); the Question about the Messiah (Mark xii. 35–7, Matt. xxii. 44–6, Luke xx. 41–4); the Anointing at Bethany (Mark xiv. 3–9, Matt. xxvi. 6–13, cf. Luke vii. 36–50); the Betrayal by Judas (Mark xiv. 10–11, Matt. xxvi. 14–16, Luke xxii. 3–6); the Trial (Mark xiv. 53 f., xv. 1 f., Matt. xxvi. 57 f., xxvii. 1 f., Luke xxii. 66 f., xxiii. 1 f.); the Last Supper (Mark xiv. 22–5, Matt. xxvi. 26–9, Luke xxii. 15–20, 1 Cor. xi. 23–6); Gethsemane (Mark xiv. 32–42, Matt. xxvi. 36–46, Luke xxii. 40–46).

According to the more usual interpretation of the entry into Jerusalem (Mark xi. 1–10, Matt. xxi. 1–9, Luke xix. 26–8), by the symbol of the ass (cf. Zech. ix. 9), and by countenancing the popular cries and actions, our Lord openly declared Himself to be the Messiah. If this were true, the conclusion could scarcely be avoided that the Messiahship was a ground, or the ground, on which He desired to be seized and condemned,[1] since He expected, or, as we ought rather to say, was resolved to die in the city. We need not, however, feel obliged to take that view into serious consideration, for it is not clear how it can be made to rest on an acceptable critical basis.

[1] So H. Monnier: 'En acceptant le titre de Fils de David que lui décernait la foule, il se désignait au Sanhédrin comme prétendant au trône messianique; à Pilate comme le Roi des Juifs et l'adversaire de César. Il fournissait ainsi à ses ennemis le prétexte dont ils avaient besoin pour le condamner' (*La Mission historique de Jésus*, p. 269).

Reasons for rejecting the 'Messianic' interpretation of the entry. We know that at the time of the Confession scene the people did not think that our Lord was the Messiah (cf. Mark viii. 28), and that at the entry He had only recently come into touch with them again after a period of separation. The sources do not permit us to believe that anything had happened in the interval which might have induced the people to identify Him with the Messiah. Indeed, the Bartimaeus incident shows that they did not now associate Him more closely with the Kingdom than they did in Galilee. He was still the herald of the Kingdom, but not the Messiah. Moreover, at the Confession scene He announced His Messiahship to the disciples in a sense (the apocalyptic 'Son of Man') which the reports of the entry are incapable of bearing. And no hint comes to us from the period of the wanderings which suggests that His views about the Messianic office had undergone a profound change. The case for the 'Messianic' interpretation of the entry is no better when we look forward instead of backward. The events subsequent to the entry do not, as we shall see, require it for their explanation, and, as has so often been pointed out, the procedure at the trial is decidedly unfavourable[1] to it. In concluding that those features of the reports which represent that the entry was avowedly 'Messianic' in purpose, and that it was understood as such by those who witnessed it, are later[2] embellishments, we may, of course, appeal to the positive testimony of John xii. 16, and to the fact that the Marcan report of the shouts of the

[1] See pp. 130 ff.

[2] So in effect Dalman (*Words of Jesus*, p. 222); J. Weiss (*Die Schriften*, p. 176–7); Wrede (*Das Messiasgeheimnis*, pp. 14 f., 44). On the other hand, Loisy: 'Il semble que Jésus lui-même ait encouragé la manifestation dont il fut l'objet en cet endroit' (ii, p. 261). 'Ainsi la consigne provisoire qui avait été donnée à Césarée de Philippe était maintenant rompue' (i, p. 215). On this supposition, however, as I have already suggested, the purport of the alleged 'Messianic' demonstrations ought to have been in agreement with our Lord's conception of the Messiahship as disclosed at the Confession scene.

people does not expressly mention the Messiah, but rather refers, when considered in itself, only to the herald of the approaching Kingdom.

§ 2. *The Purification of the Temple*

I pass on to the story of the Purification of the Temple[1] (Mark xi. 15–19, Matt. xxi. 12–13, Luke xix. 45–6). The important thing for our purpose is our Lord's motive, and accordingly it is not necessary to linger over particular points which are usually discussed in the commentaries.

The importance of deciding whether the action was the result of careful deliberation or not. There is no direct indication in the sources as to whether the act was the result of the indignation of the moment or of careful deliberation. In the former case, the remarkable thing about the incident is this, that while it was, in effect, a declaration of war on the Sanhedrin (which sanctioned the abuses), and thus was one of the factors which led to our Lord's death, yet it could hardly have been intended by Him to be so. The more we regard the action as unpremeditated, and the more weight we assign to the part which it played in bringing about His death, the more probable it becomes that He lost control over events at the outset of the Jerusalem appeal and obscured the issue on which He desired to die. But that is to do less than justice to the historic figure which confronts us in the Gospels. He would not have endangered His cause by hasty action.

Our Lord's motive: to make Himself safe for a time in Jerusalem through popular support. On the other alternative, what was the motive? Let us go back a little. Some months earlier the religious leaders in Galilee had become our Lord's sworn foes—inevitably so, their views about the authority and importance of the Torah being what they were. But it is not at all likely that the hostility was merely local. On the con-

[1] The weight of critical opinion is against the Johannine grouping (ii. 13 f.).

trary, the body of 'scribes who came down from Jerusalem' (Mark iii. 22, vii. 1) to Galilee was probably a deputation from the Sanhedrin, which, in that case, would not have been unprepared to endorse the attitude which lay behind the damning charge of collusion with Beelzebul (Mark iii. 22), and also the extreme measures which were framed, with the support of the Herodians, against Jesus (Mark iii. 6). We may, therefore, conclude that our Lord would have recognized that He would be in great peril from the moment that He assumed an active rôle in Jerusalem. We have already found reason to believe that He went to Jerusalem in order to induce His countrymen, gathered together in the city in such large numbers on account of Passover, to form a mass-movement of repentance, and that He had no expectation of achieving His purpose apart from His death. That, indeed, would be the primary means by which He would accomplish[1] it. Now it seems to me that our Lord would not have reposed His hopes on the effects of His death unless He had also realized the vital importance of making the people understand full well the end for which He was dying. But in order to accomplish this preliminary task He would, it is certain, have regarded a period of safety from the machinations of His opponents as an imperative necessity. And He would also have wanted to command the attention of His countrymen as quickly as possible, since in any case it was not likely that the crisis would be long delayed. Looked at in the light

[1] I therefore venture to disagree entirely with Prof. B. W. Bacon, who thinks that the Temple-incident shows us 'the motive for Jesus' going up to Jerusalem' (*Beginnings of Gospel Story*, p. 161). I also controvert above by implication the more recently expressed opinion of this distinguished critic that the crucifixion 'was an unforeseen consequence of Jesus' attempt to take the temple out of the control of a corrupt and unworthy priesthood and make it again his Father's house' (*Jesus and Paul*, p. 50). Our Lord knew full well what He was doing. And he went to Jerusalem with a profounder purpose than that of achieving a reformation at the Temple. It is, moreover, clear that the sources do not indicate that His temporary control was as extensive as Prof. Bacon represents (see Swete, *St. Mark*, p. 257).

of these considerations, the Purification of the Temple is capable of being regarded, in its inwardness, as a precautionary measure intended by our Lord to ensure that He would be safe in the city for a while—safe long enough to enable Him to make the conscience of the people acutely alive to the fact that He was being brought to death for the sake of the Kingdom of God, and, therefore, for their sakes. He expected the desired period of safety to come through the popular support which the action would be certain to win for Him.

§ 3. *The Desire of the Hierarchy to destroy Jesus*

Mark goes on to say (xi. 18) that the chief priests and the scribes were now seeking how they might destroy our Lord. For the Temple incident had roused them ; and they were afraid of Him owing to the hold on the people which His action, and the teaching which accompanied it, had obtained for Him.

Matthew has suppressed this pendant, substituting instead of it the story (xxi. 15–16) of the cries of the children in the temple and of the indignation of the hierarchs and the scribes thereat. Here the report in Matthew seems to be only editorial.

Luke (xix. 47–8) has a parallel to Mark : daily our Lord taught in the temple ; the people were greatly impressed by the teaching ; His opponents wanted to destroy Him, but could not find a pretext for doing so. All this fully accords with historical probability.

The reason why Jesus cannot for the moment be suppressed. In explanation of the temporary powerlessness of the officials, it is probably right to say that they desired to frame a charge against our Lord which would serve the double purpose of securing a condemnation before the Roman tribunal and of alienating the sympathies of the people and so of wrecking His work.

§ 4. *The Question about Authority*

Possibly the opponents of Jesus hoped for an avowal of Messiahship. Perhaps it was in the hope of obtaining material for the above-mentioned charge that the members of the Sanhedrin asked the question about[1] authority (Mark xi. 27–33, Matt. xxi. 23–7, Luke xx. 1–8). Possibly they wished to draw from Him an avowal of Messiahship.[2] That would have enabled them to arraign Him before Pilate as being dangerous to the Roman régime, and to brand Him in the eyes of the people (who did not think he was the Messiah) as a false claimant to the throne of David. In the result He would also inevitably have been regarded by the people as a discredited herald of the Kingdom. That is the situation which the Sanhedrin, aided by Judas,[3] was able to bring about a few days later; but the evidence does not permit us to do more than surmise that that may have been the development which our Lord's opponents hoped for from the present encounter.

The dilemma created by the counter-question of Jesus. But we do at any rate know what our Lord thought about 'John's baptism';[4] and, with the help of the estimate which He had framed of it, we can probably understand what significance the incident had for Him. In His own conviction 'John's baptism' was 'from heaven' because it was the work of the returned Elijah, the movement of repentance which, as

[1] The question did not relate exclusively to the control which our Lord had assumed in the temple-court (cf. Loisy, vol. ii, p. 295–6). The fact that in the counter-question He invited a pronouncement on the authority of the Baptist's mission indicates that He understood His opponents' inquiry to convey at bottom a challenge to the authority of His own.

[2] Loisy remarks: 'Dans leur pensée, Jésus allait être obligé d'avouer qu'il était le Messie, ou tout au moins qu'il venait au nom de Dieu, puisqu'il n'avait aucune mission des autorités établies' (vol. ii, p. 295).

[3] See pp. 129 ff.

[4] By 'John's Baptism' is meant 'the Baptist's work and teaching as a whole, symbolized by its visible expression' (Swete, *St. Mark*, p. 263).

Malachi had announced, would precede the coming of the Kingdom. Those who had entered this movement 'from the days of John the Baptist until now' had their place in the coming Kingdom guaranteed to them. He had come to Jerusalem with the desire to complete the work which the Baptist had begun. John's work and His own had therefore a fundamental unity and the same heavenly origin and sanction. Whether He had made public His identification of the Baptist with Elijah is not certain.[1] But at any rate everybody must have considered that the broad aim of John's activity was the same as that of our Lord, and accordingly that a judgement passed on the work of the former would have been applicable also to that of the latter. Thus our Lord probably intended the counter-question to embarrass[2] His antagonists. For if they had replied 'from heaven' they could not have continued to oppose Him. But if, on the other hand, they had answered 'from men', they would have appeared in a still worse light in the eyes of the people devoted to the memory of the Baptist.

§ 5. *The Husbandmen and the Heir*

The allegory ought not to be used for the elucidation of our Lord's purpose in Jerusalem. According to the parable, or rather the allegory, of the Husbandmen and the Heir (Mark xii. 1–12; Matthew xxi. 33–46; Luke xx. 9–19), at any rate,

[1] According to the testimony of Q (Matt. xi. 7 f. = Luke vii 24 f.; cf. Matt. xi. 14), our Lord did publicly identify the Baptist with Elijah by applying to him Malachi iii. 1. But the passage is misquoted; John becomes the precursor of the Messiah (our Lord Himself), which is not the case in Malachi. Certainly that particular at any rate is secondary (see Loisy, i, p. 668). If it be supposed that our Lord did publicly quote Mal. iii. 1, but in its original form, it is not probable, in view of Mark viii. 28, that He did so before the time of the appeal in Jerusalem; and that would suggest the present encounter as the most likely occasion.

[2] So Loisy, vol. ii, p. 296.

as the evangelists and their readers understood it, our Lord openly intimated in Jerusalem that He[1] was in a unique sense God's Son and the heir of the vineyard (Israel), i. e. the Messiah (cf. also the words about 'the stone[2] which the builders rejected'). Moreover, it is represented that 'the husbandmen' (i. e. primarily the Jewish religious authorities) allowed amongst themselves that He was not a false Messiah, and therefore decided to kill Him, that the inheritance might be theirs. These representations do not admit of being harmonized in any probable way with the conclusions which we have already framed about Jesus and the Messiah. And further (to mention only one more difficulty), if they are trustworthy, how could there have been any difficulty about witnesses at the trial? Doubtless the many critics[3] who consider that the allegory has been handed down in an unhistorical form are right. It would therefore be useless to consider what bearing the allegory might have on the mission of Jesus in Jerusalem.

[1] A. Gray (*Hibbert Journal*, October 1920), accepting the allegory as it stands, argues that by the 'beloved Son' and 'heir' our Lord meant John the Baptist. The grounds on which the theory rests are very dubious. At the end of the article the author makes this strange remark: 'Looking only into the guilty minds of his judges, we may say that if Jesus had held his peace about John there would have been no Crucifixion.'

[2] For the application of the 'stone' to the Messiah, see Justin (*Dial.* xxxiv, xxxvi), and Targ. Isa. xxviii. 16, Sanh. 38 a. (See the note in McNeile, *Gospel accor. to St. Matthew*, p. 311.)

[3] Prof. F. C. Burkitt thinks that the absence of any reference to the resurrection of our Lord is 'little short of positive proof . . . that the parable is a genuine historical reminiscence of words spoken by Jesus Himself' (*Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions*, vol. ii, p. 321–2). But it should be observed that the Synoptics represent that the intimations of the coming resurrection were not made to the public. In view of the existence of a tradition to this effect in the early Church, the fact that the allegory is silent about the resurrection can hardly be regarded as significant.

§ 6. *The Tribute Money*

Mark goes on to relate the story of the Tribute Money (xii. 13–17, Matt. xxii. 15–22, Luke xx. 20–6). There seems to be no good reason for doubting the historicity of the incident, or its present setting. It is not likely to have happened in Galilee, as the *tributum capitis* was not imposed there. The story does not, however, bring into view the purpose which our Lord was pursuing in the city. What it does show us is His opponents reacting to His work there: they are once more in quest of a reason for suppressing Him.

Pharisees and Herodians,[1] it is said, questioned our Lord as to whether it was in accordance with the Torah (ἔξεστιν) to pay the poll-tax to the Emperor. As the sources indicate, it was a catch-question, the purpose being either to bring our Lord into collision with the Roman[2] authority, or to rob Him of popular sympathy.[3] In making His famous reply our

[1] According to Luke xxiii. 7 f. Herod Antipas was in Jerusalem at this Passover season; apparently supporters of the Herodian régime had accompanied him. Here, as in Galilee, the Herodians were hostile to our Lord. Perhaps they took part in the event of a negative answer being given. Pharisees would have wanted to escape the responsibility of instituting proceedings on a charge which would not have had popular support and which would have traversed their own general position on the Roman question.

[2] In his *Saint Marc* (p. 293) Lagrange says: 'Judas [le Galiléen] se donna très probablement comme Messie (*Le Messianisme*, p. 18), avec le dilemme si bien exprimé par Josèphe: obéir à Dieu ou aux hommes. Les Sanhédrites se disaient que Jésus, se présentant comme Messie, ne pourrait pas donner une autre solution. Il serait donc regardé comme un nouveau Judas le Galiléen, et l'autorité romaine s'empresserait de le faire périr pour éviter une nouvelle révolte.' This is to put the matter in a somewhat wrong perspective. On critical examination, the evidence does not indicate that our Lord was presenting Himself in Jerusalem as the Messiah.

[3] The tax was, of course, highly offensive to patriotic Jews; cf. the attitude of Judas the Gaulonite (Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 1. 1) and of Eleazar (*BJ.* vii. 8. 6). At the revolt under Bar Cochba Roman money was declared to be out of currency (cf. Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge*, p. 256).

Lord's concern was to avoid the dilemma,[1] and this that He might retain liberty to prosecute His mission.

I pass by the discussions about the Resurrection (xii. 18–27, Matt. xxii. 23–33, Luke xx. 27-38) and the Greatest Commandment (xii. 28–34, Matt. xxii. 34–40, Luke xx. 39–40, x. 25–8). They throw no fresh light on our Lord's aim in the city.

§ 7. *The Question about the Messiah*

In a passage which is traditionally assigned to the Jerusalem period, our Lord is said to have questioned the opinion, scribal and popular, about the Messiahship and David's son (Mark xii. 35–7, Matt. xxii. 41–6, Luke xx. 41–4). Only here are we told that He opened up the matter of the Messiahship in public.

According to Mark, Jesus invited the populace to appreciate a difficulty attaching to the received view. How could David, under inspiration, have called the Messiah his 'lord' if he had expected him to be his 'son'?

The Matthaean editor departs somewhat from his Marcan source by representing that our Lord asked a group of Pharisees, 'whose son is the Messiah?' and that they replied, 'the son of David'. He then, like Mark, cites Ps. 110.[2]

Luke seems to have thought that the question was put to the scribes who are said to have been impressed by the way in which Jesus had met the Sadducees' objection to the resurrection (cf. verse 39).

[1] In agreement with Wellhausen: 'Zur Überraschung der Gegner versteht er es, dem Dilemma sich zu entziehen. Etwas weiteres beabsichtigt er nicht' (*Ev. Marci*, p. 94).

[2] It is uncertain whether this Psalm was applied to the Messiah by Jews of our Lord's time; no reference to it in that sense is found in the rabbinic writings earlier than *c.* 260 A.D. (Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 286).

It is not necessary to discuss here the above variations; for at bottom the reports present the same problem.[1] Just what the problem is, however, is not altogether clear.

Was Jesus referring only to the Messiah's descent, or to his functions as well? On the supposition that Jesus was arguing about the descent of the Messiah, it seems to be apparent, if the incident is historic,[2] that He meant, in effect, either that the absence of Davidic descent need not be a disqualification for Messiahship, or quite definitely that the Messiah would not be a scion of David's house. So much had been revealed to David himself. If, on the other hand, our Lord was contemplating the functions of the Messiah, it is scarcely doubtful that the inference which He desired His audience to draw from His words was that the Messiah need not, or would not, play the expected rôle of the Davidic Messiah, and that in not doing so he could rest on the authority of a 'word of the Lord' to David himself.

Jesus was not arguing about the descent of the Messiah. It is (to consider the former alternative) difficult to understand why our Lord should have taken steps to refute the general opinion about the descent of the Messiah, except on the suppositions that the purpose which He had come to Jerusalem to realize included the recognition of Himself as the Messiah, that He was aware that He could not establish a claim to be a scion of David's house, and that the hierarchy had already turned, or soon would turn, this overwhelming

[1] Spitta, who holds that Luke is following the order of material in the (hypothetical) *Grundschrift*, thinks that our Lord was still addressing the Sadducees and was again dealing with their views about the Resurrection. He was not denying the Davidic descent of the Messiah; on the contrary, he is David's son, but in the time of the Resurrection and Parousia, when ordinary human relationships will cease, he will be Lord's lord. (See *Streitfragen*, pp. 152 ff., and *Die syn., Grundschrift*, pp. 325 ff.) Even on Spitta's theory of the sources, this is an unnecessary and indeed a strained interpretation.

[2] It is doubted by a minority group of critics, e.g. J. Weiss (*Die Schriften*, vol. i, pp. 188–9), Bacon (*Beginnings of Gospel Story*, pp. 169, 175).

objection against him. But that proposal is quite unsatisfactory.[1] For our Lord came to Jerusalem (we have urged) in the belief that death awaited Him and afterwards the office of the apocalyptic 'Son of Man'. If He had expected to find recognition in Jerusalem as the Messiah, it would have been as one destined to be manifested as that august figure of the future. But there is no evidence in our sources that He attempted to find such recognition; and, considering the attitude even of the disciples themselves to His disclosures at the Confession scene, it is antecedently most unlikely that He would have thought it possible that He might find it in Jerusalem, or desirable to endeavour to do so. Further, once our Lord was convinced about His Messianic rôle, the matter of Davidic descent, whether or not it was His, must have been indifferent to Him. Again, the surmise that His foes were undermining, or were likely to undermine, the loyalty of the populace to Him as the Messiah, has nothing in its favour except the traditional interpretation of the Bartimaeus incident and of the entry into the city, which we have ventured to reject.

Jesus was correcting a common opinion about the rôle of the Messiah. What is to be said for the other view according to which the expression υἱὸς Δαυείδ had here a wider content than that of descent?[2] It presents fewer difficulties. When it is allowed that our Lord Himself was persuaded that the Davidic Messiah would never appear[3] (since He Himself would be manifested as the Messiah, but not the Davidic), it

[1] In disagreement with Loisy (vol. ii, p. 362) and Pfleiderer (*Primitive Christianity*, vol. ii, p. 61).

[2] 'Throughout the passage, the term "Son of David" is used in a pregnant sense, to denote not merely physical descent, but likeness in character and vocation.' (Prof. E. F. Scott, *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, p. 186.)

[3] Apart from the instances which we have already noticed, the title occurs characteristically in Matt. in ix. 27, xii. 23, xv. 22, xxi. 15, where it merely expresses the editor's tendency to assimilate the figure of our Lord to the Old Testament.

becomes likely that He was correcting a common opinion about Messiah's functions. By implication He was also showing that the coming Kingdom would not be identical with 'the Kingdom of our father David'. The appeal to the supposed words of David would have served as a safeguard against an unfavourable reception of His teaching.

The meaning of the passage from the point of view of the early Christian community. Investigation of the original meaning of the passage is complicated by the fact that it is almost certainly only a fragment of the historic discussion. Only sufficient has been transmitted to serve as an authoritative verification of the conviction of the early Christian community that our Lord in His real being was the Son of God. Looked at from this later point of view, the passage seems to assert that He was the Son of God without denying that He was also of Davidic descent in the sense that Joseph had acknowledged[1] Him as his son. Here our Lord's special purpose in precipitating the discussion cannot, it seems to me, be seen.[2] On the other hand, it may well be that He and some of His contemporaries believed that He was of Davidic descent.[3] It should be said, moreover, that our Lord's identification of Himself with 'the Son of Man' implies a consciousness of unique Sonship.

The Synoptic material which lies between the 'Question about the Messiah' and the incident of the 'Anointing at Bethany' (Mark xiv. 3-9, Matt. xxvi. 6-13; cf. Luke vii. 36-50) may be ignored for the present. The latter episode itself would not require notice were it not for the theory that the

[1] On this point see Dalman (*Words of Jesus*, Eng. trans., pp. 319-20).

[2] It should be said, however, that the opinion of H. J. Holtzmann (who accepts the passage as historical) has weighty endorsement: '. . . Jesus wolle vielmehr der Vermuthung begegnen, dass er seine messianischen Aussprüche nur aus seiner davidischen Abstammung ableite, und dafür die Erkenntniss befördern, dass er, wenn auch immerhin Davids, so doch als Messias Gottes Sohn sei'. *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.*, vol. i, p. 95. I have indicated above on what grounds I venture to depart from this judgement.

[3] See Dalman's discussion (*Words of Jesus*, p. 319 f.).

historic fact behind the present report is that our Lord was anointed for Messiahship.

§ 8. *The Anointing at Bethany*

An unnamed woman, Mark reports, anointed our Lord's head in the house of 'Simon the leper'. Some of the company (Matthew has interpreted τινες as οἱ μαθηταί) protested that the costly preparation might better have been sold for the benefit of the poor. Our Lord rebuked them for a misguided interference. The needs of the poor could always be attended to, whereas He Himself would shortly die. The woman had anointed His body beforehand with a view to its preparation for burial, and the memory of her action would live wherever the world-wide announcement of the Gospel should be made.

As regards the substance and position of the passage, Matthew has followed Mark. Luke has given no parallel here, probably because he had already related a broadly similar incident in vii. 36–50.

The theories that our Lord was anointed for Messiahship. The theory that our Lord was originally anointed for Messiahship has been advanced, so far as I have noticed, in two forms. According to one view (that of Professor Bacon),[1] He was approached by an enthusiastic disciple and anointed King of the Jews (p. 492). But whilst He 'accepts the tribute' He 'transmutes its sense' (p. 488). He declared in effect: 'Not a throne, but martyrdom awaits me'. Verse 8 (προέλαβεν μυρίσαι τὸ σῶμά μου εἰς τὸν ἐνταφιασμόν) is historical.

According to the other view (that of Professor Pfleiderer[2]), verse 8 'can only be regarded as an interpretation of the act which grew up later in the Church'. The anointing 'would appear' to have been 'intended as a consecration to the Messianic Kingship', and (as Professor Pfleiderer

[1] See the article 'What did Judas betray?' in *Hibbert Journal*, April 1921; also *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, pp. 199 ff.

[2] See *Primitive Christianity*, Eng. trans., vol. ii, pp. 71–2.

doubtless meant) was accepted as such by our Lord, who, though not of Davidic descent, 'cherished the thought that He was destined to be the Messiah . . . in the traditional sense of the term, namely, as the theocratic Head of the People of God.[1] . . .'

Reasons why the theories should be rejected. The importance of the former view consists not in any light which it throws for us at this stage of the discussion on our Lord's aim in Jerusalem (since it is allowed that He affirmed that the immediate prospect for Himself was not Messiah's throne, but death), but in the theory which it is made to serve. Professor Bacon holds that what Judas betrayed to the hierarchy was the news of the anointing; and this the Sanhedrin decided to make the pretext for the arraignment before Pilate. The grounds on which I venture to dissent from this opinion will be found in the discussion on the part played by Judas.

The other view traverses the conclusions which we have already put forward about our Lord's matured conception of His Messiahship. Professor Pfleiderer's position, however, is consistent and intelligible: the journey to Jerusalem was not avowedly a death-journey; our Lord expected that the result of His work in the city would include His assumption of the Messianic office 'in the traditional sense of the term'. Accordingly He did not settle the question of His Messiahship by identifying Himself with the apocalyptic 'Son of Man'. That was the work of the early Christian community (*Prim. Christianity*, vol. ii, p. 35). If these are the historic facts, the theory of an anointing for Messianic Kingship can at least claim support in Semitic custom. If, on the other hand, as we have urged, our Lord expected first death and then return as 'the Son of Man', it need not be taken into serious consideration. In these circumstances, the broad fact that the story, in its present form, attaches no Messianic significance to the anointing, is worthy of trust.

[1] *Prim. Christianity*, p. 62.

Unhistorical features of the story. This is not to say that the report, regarded in detail, is beyond suspicion. Only in one respect, however, need the question of historicity concern us. Our Lord would not have said to the disciples that they would always have the poor with them, whereas He Himself would be shortly taken away from them in death (verse 7); for they were to die with Him in the city. Accordingly either His rebuke of those who protested against the woman's tribute has undergone modification, or, by interpreting τινες as οἱ μαθηταί, the Matthaean editor has made an unhappy guess. As regards v. 9, this, as the commentators usually allow, doubtless reflects later thought.

§ 9. *The Betrayal by Judas*

The story of the betrayal by Judas is related by all the Synoptists (Mark xiv. 10–11, Matt. xxvi. 14–16, Luke xxii. 3–6), but their reports leave in obscurity the things which the historian most desires to know.

The problems raised by the action of Judas. What was it that Judas betrayed? and how is his disloyalty to be accounted for? The former question leads on to another of great importance: what consequences for his work in Jerusalem did our Lord recognize in the betrayal?

What did Judas betray? The suggestion of the Synoptic editors, that Judas undertook to inform the hierarchy of a suitable place and time for a private arrest, when there would be no risk of resistance by the multitude (cf. Mark xiv. 2 and parallels), is certainly quite inadequate. For this, as Professor Bacon remarks, the aid of Judas would not have been necessary. It is more than probable that what our Lord's opponents wanted was a charge which would secure His condemnation by Pilate and at the same time be endorsed by the multitude, which at present was disposed to be on the side of the Galilean prophet (cf. Mark xii. 12 = Matt. xxi. 46 = Luke xx. 19; Luke xxi. 38, &c.). In the event, that is just

what they were able to obtain. Did Judas make it possible? Having regard to the fact that at the Confession scene our Lord had forbidden the disciples to announce in public that He was the Messiah, and that, prior to the Judas incident, there is no evidence which, after careful consideration, requires the supposition that the reserve was cast away or the pledge broken, how is it that He is reported to have been put to death as a claimant to the throne of Israel? Before that could have been possible it would appear *prima facie* that disloyalty must have proceeded from within the body of the intimate disciples, and accordingly that we know what it was that Judas betrayed. Probably that is the case. Nevertheless the matter requires further consideration. A point that needs to be borne in mind in connexion with the theory of the betrayal by Judas of the 'Messianic secret' is this, that Judas was not in a position to inform the hierarchy that our Lord considered Himself to be the Davidic Messiah, or the Messiah 'in the traditional sense', though not a descendant of David. What Judas knew and could have revealed was our Lord's expectation about His return as 'the Son of Man'. Let us, however, see how this theory of what Judas did appears in the light of the reports of the legal proceedings.

The theory that Judas made known to the hierarchy secret information about Jesus and the Messiahship examined in the light of the legal proceedings. (*a*) *The Marcan account of the legal proceedings taken against Jesus.* The Marcan editor (xiv. 53 f.) reports that our Lord was brought before the whole Sanhedrin in the course of the night of the arrest. It was desired to find a capital charge, but, at first, evidence conformable to Jewish legal requirements was not forthcoming. Presently certain witnesses declared that they had heard our Lord say that He would destroy the existing temple and build another διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν. But that testimony too was legally faulty. Throughout all this our Lord refused to make any reply to His accusers' statements. Then the

high-priest addressed to Him the question, 'Art thou the Christ the Son of the Blessed One?' and He returned an unreserved affirmative (ἐγώ εἰμι), coupling with it the declaration that His detractors would 'see the Son of Man sitting at the right of the Power and coming with the clouds of heaven'. For this avowal, which the high-priest characterized as blasphemy, the Sanhedrin condemned Him to death. In the morning the Sanhedrin met again, and then took our Lord before the Roman procurator. On being asked by Pilate, 'Art thou the King of the Jews?' He answered σὺ λέγεις. Unconvinced of the guilt of the prisoner, Pilate heard many other charges, wanted to know why He did not defend Himself, and was disposed to release Him instead of Barabbas. In the end, however, although by then he believed that our Lord was innocent, Pilate authorized the crucifixion because he wished to satisfy the ὄχλος. The formal charge on which He died was that of claiming to be 'the King of the Jews' (xv. 26; cf. verses 17 f., 32).

(*b*) *The Matthaean report of the legal proceedings.* In its broad outlines the report of the Matthaean editor (xxvi. 51 f.) is in agreement with that of the Marcan. The former, however, has a somewhat different account of the charge concerning the destruction of the temple. Two persons (Mark: τινες) are said to have made the deposition, which took the form of an allegation that our Lord had said that He was able to destroy the temple (Mark: 'I will destroy . . .'). Further, the Marcan characterization of the existing and the new temples is absent, and nothing is said about the testimony not tallying—perhaps because the point had already been emphasized (verses 59-60) that the evidence which the Sanhedrin procured was perjured. The Matthaean editor is also at pains to show that our Lord was required to declare on oath whether or not He claimed the Messiahship. And instead of the Marcan ἐγώ εἰμι, καὶ ὄψεσθε, κτλ., Matthew has, σὺ εἶπας· πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀπ' ἄρτι ὄψεσθε, κτλ. For his account of the trial before Pilate, Matthew follows Mark with but

little variation. Additional proofs of the innocence of the prisoner are offered in the dream of Pilate's wife (verse 19) and his symbolical hand-washing (v. 24).

(*c*) *The Lucan account of the legal proceedings.* According to Luke (xxii. 66 f.), the examination before the Sanhedrin took place on the morning following the arrest. Before the demand, 'If thou art the Messiah, tell us,' there was no search for a case against our Lord other than that of the Messiahship. The accusers received the reply that if He told them they would not believe, and if He asked them they would not answer; and further that ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, they would see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the power of God. On being asked 'Art thou then the Son of God?' He said, ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι. After this, further witness was considered to be unnecessary. There was no passing of sentence. Before Pilate our Lord was charged with perverting the Jewish nation, forbidding that tribute should be given to the Emperor, and claiming to be Χριστὸν βασιλέα. Pilate asked Him, 'Art thou the King of the Jews?' and received the reply, σὺ λέγεις.[1] In what follows Luke goes farther even than Matthew in exonerating[2] the Roman procurator and in fastening the responsibility for our Lord's death on the Jews; and even Herod comes in for honourable mention.[3] Luke agrees with Mark (and Matt.) about the formal charge on which Jesus died.

[1] This expression, as also σὺ εἶπας, is here an 'affirmative with reservations' (see Dalman's discussion, *Words of Jesus*, p. 307 f.). Questioned outright our Lord could not disown His own conviction; and besides, He could no longer maintain reserve, for He knew that Judas had broken faith. And yet He was not being fairly accused; the kingship which He had anticipated was that of the apocalyptic Son of Man. The Marcan ἐγώ εἰμι before Caiaphas is perhaps more precise than the original reply. The report of the full response to Caiaphas' question will come under consideration again on p. 157 n.

[2] This feature of the report is doubtless to be traced to the apologetic motive of the Evangelists: our Lord and His followers of His own time and later were not politically dangerous. See Montefiore, *Synoptic Gospels*, i, p. 362.

[3] See p. 29 n.

The two questions to be considered. Of the several problems which the trial narratives raise we are concerned only with these: the historic charge on which our Lord was condemned, and how it was that His opponents were able to formulate it.

The testimony of the sources that the Jewish authorities arraigned Jesus before Pilate on the ground (primarily at any rate) that He was a 'usurper of royalty', and that Pilate sanctioned His crucifixion as such, scarcely admits of reasonable doubt. But why was it that the Jewish authorities tried first of all to establish some other charge against[1] Him? On first thoughts, the search for material for an accusation other than that of treason against the Emperor seems to be somewhat unfavourable to the theory that Judas betrayed our Lord's belief about His Messiahship. In reality, however, it is not probable that the theory loses any of its force on that account. As we know from our earlier discussion, and from the high-priest's demand, the necessary number of witnesses could not be found. Further, it is likely enough that some uncertainty existed as to whether our Lord might not refuse to make the Jewish authorities themselves the witnesses. Again, it is not at all unlikely that the precise character of that which Judas could have betrayed induced the religious authorities to try other possibilities before seeking to make the Messiahship the criminal charge. Judas knew (as we have said) that our Lord expected to be the Ruler in the coming Kingdom, but only after His death. That is what he would have told the Jewish officials if his

[1] Wellhausen, remarking that according to the Jewish ideas it was not blasphemy for any one to say that he was the Messiah, and excising xiv. 59, 61, 62 as unhistorical, contends that the blasphemy for which our Lord was denounced related to the saying about the destruction of the temple. It is easy for Wellhausen to do this, since he does not think that our Lord identified Himself with the Son of Man. The first point, however, is hardly relevant to the case. For, as Dalman points out, it was the saying about the Son of Man (our Lord Himself) sitting at God's right hand which the high-priest pronounced a case of blasphemy (*Words of Jesus*, pp. 313–14.)

disclosures related to the Messiahship. It may well be that our Lord's opponents did not want to risk their case on this charge, unless they were compelled to do so; for, if presented without distortion, it might have struck a Roman as fantastic and absurd.

The above considerations more than counterbalance such likelihood as may be thought to attach to a conjecture that, having regard to the course which the proceedings took, the Sanhedrin may not have been in possession of 'the Messianic secret' at the outset.

Perhaps, however, one ought to consider whether the hierarchy commenced proceedings, not indeed in possession of the secret of the Messiahship, but yet suspecting, owing to their knowledge of a saying of our Lord about the destruction of the temple, that He considered Himself to be the Messiah, and were bent on eliciting an avowal. But this is only a fruitless groping amongst shadows. For no known saying of our Lord makes Him the agent in the destruction of the temple; and Mark[1] xiii. 2 (Matt. xxiv. 2, Luke xxi. 6) would not have been offensive to Jewish sentiment, since it probably means that in the age to come the old temple would be superseded by a new.[2] Doubtless these considerations are not in themselves decisive; but we may add to them the strong improbability that our Lord would have publicly declared that He would or could destroy the present temple and build another, if such an announcement was likely to provide the subject-matter for an inference that He must be the Messiah. He would not, we may surely say, have taken the risk. If such a saying ever fell from His lips it would have been in circumstances of privacy; in which case it would have been Judas who transmitted it to the hierarchy (who arranged beforehand about the witnesses); but certainly Judas would not have done so without also disclosing what he knew about the Messiahship. The probabilities are, however, that the

[1] Βλέπεις ταύτας τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδομάς; οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ.

[2] Cf. Volz, *Jüd. Eschat.*, p. 334.

charge about destroying the temple was a misrepresentation of Mark xiii. 2, or something very like it, and that the testimony of the witnesses was rejected because, as Mark indicates, it did not satisfy legal requirements.[1]

Conclusion about the question, What did Judas betray? I conclude that at the commencement of the investigation the Jewish authorities were well aware that our Lord had identified Himself with the 'Son of Man'; otherwise, how the Messiahship became the charge before Pilate is inexplicable. As this knowledge was not common property, ample reason exists for holding that Judas betrayed it.

The reason for the disloyalty of Judas. Judas's motive is not to be ascertained from the reports of his action (Mark xiv. 10–11, Matt. xxvi. 14–16, Luke xxii. 3–6). Mark merely says that the ἀρχιερεῖς promised him a monetary reward for information of which they were glad to hear. Matthew has found in this an indication that Judas was prompted by avarice (τί θέλετέ μοι δοῦναι κτλ.). Luke has traced the disloyalty to the agency of Satan (v. 3). But the reason for the treachery, so far as it can now be recovered with any probability, is best understood from the so-called second Peter-scene at the Confession. Peter's abhorrence of our Lord's programme was doubtless shared at the time by all the other intimate disciples; in the case of Judas it evidently gathered strength as time went on; in the end it worked itself out in action. In the fact of the betrayal we may see how groundless our Lord's eschatological expectations now seemed to Judas to be. By crossing over to the side of our Lord's opponents, with his knowledge and its so great power of evil, instead of retiring from the circle of the disciples and maintaining silence, this wretched figure seems to have been bent on ensuring his own safety before it was too late.

The bearing[2] *of Judas's act of betrayal on the work which had*

[1] Cf. Num. xxxv. 30, Deut. xvii. 15, xix. 6.

[2] This is a matter of crucial importance for the main problem. All that I have to say in the rest of this work is closely bound up with it.

drawn our Lord to Jerusalem. How calamitous a thing the treachery of Judas was is indicated by the fact that its immediate result was the seizure of Jesus and His execution on an issue which turned the people against Him and thus broke up the movement of repentance. The critics who think that since the Bartimaeus incident and the entry into the city our Lord's Messiahship had been more or less common knowledge (and who accordingly do not advance the foregoing theory of what Judas betrayed) are compelled to recognize a problem in the sudden veering of the people after the Jewish proceedings. But no problem exists if (as we have argued) our Lord maintained His reserve and Judas betrayed His secret. In Jerusalem the people regarded Him as a prophet—perhaps, as in Galilee (Mark viii. 28), a prophet of peculiar eminence and significance. The Jewish authorities, we may be sure, at once noised abroad the findings about the Messiahship at the examination before Caiaphas. They shrewdly judged what would be the effect of this information on a populace which wanted 'the Kingdom of our father David' under the rule of the 'Son of David'. It turned our Lord from 'a prophet worthy of honour into a deluded enthusiast and blasphemer' (Schweitzer, *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 395). If anything further be needed in explanation of the shouts for His death, it is not far away: as His anticipations about the Messianic office were false, His public announcement of the nearness of the Kingdom came under the same repudiation. It is, therefore, no matter for surprise that so violent a reaction should have followed hard on the discovery that passionate hopes were without foundation.

Our Lord's last thoughts about His mission.[1] For the understanding of our Lord's last thoughts about His mission, it is necessary to pay full regard to the fact that in the clamour of the people for His execution He must have seen the collapse of the movement of repentance. Does that mean

[1] Nearly the whole of the remainder of the present work deals with this question.

that He knew His mission had failed? If He went to Jerusalem to force the Kingdom to come, and if He thought that it would not come without an adequate repentance of the people, then after the treachery of Judas it is not clear, to say the least, how He could have expected that the object of His mission would be realized. On the other hand, if He did not think that the coming of the Kingdom depended on repentance —if, that is to say, He regarded its arrival as inevitable whether any considerable proportion of the people was prepared or not—then it looks as if we must say that at the coming of the new order of things He thought that the earth would be smitten with a curse (cf. Malachi iv. 5-6), and that if the Kingdom itself was possessed by any of His living[1] countrymen, it would be by a small remnant. For certainly we can hardly do other than infer from the situation which arose through the betrayal that our Lord was being brought to death on an issue which robbed His Passion of the significance with which He had previously invested it, and that He knew that this was so. Gethsemane supports these general considerations and with their aid can remain free from strained interpretation.[2]

Did Jesus believe that the coming of the Kingdom depended on an adequate repentance of the people? Reasons for a negative answer. Let us scrutinize more closely the alternatives just alluded to. That our Lord's ruling concern in Jerusalem, as in Galilee, was the Kingdom of God is not in need of any proof, nor accordingly that He went to Jerusalem to complete the work which He had commenced in Galilee. This too, I think, is not to be doubted: His immediate aim in Jerusalem, as in Galilee, was to procure repentance; if the synoptic editors do not expressly say so, that is only because they had other preoccupations. But did He think of repentance on

[1] God would not in any case be left without a people. Doubtless Jesus shared the belief that the righteous of the past would rise and enter the Kingdom (cf. Matt. viii. 11, Luke xiii. 28).

[2] See the discussion of Gethsemane on pp. 149–50.

some considerable scale as determining the coming of the Kingdom, or was this to be unconditioned from the human side? On the latter hypothesis, the main purpose of His mission was to prepare as many of His countrymen as possible for a *dénouement* which was inevitable. The probabilities are that that is true.[1] It cannot be without significance that in Daniel and Enoch 37–71 the coming of 'the Son of Man' does not depend on repentance; here indeed the manifestation takes place when the powers of evil are in the ascendant. In Malachi, too (iv. 4 f.)—a passage which certainly potently influenced our Lord—the arrival of 'the great and terrible day of the Lord' does not result from the work of Elijah, whose function is to make a way of escape from the approaching doom. The same point of view is found in the Synoptics. Thus in the pericope about 'the days of the Son of Man' (Luke xvii. 22 f., Matt. xxiv. 26–8, 37–41) it is not repentance which will cause 'the Son of Man' to be revealed; on the contrary, He will come in its absence. Again, if, owing to the fate which befell the movement of repentance through the action of Judas and the hierarchy, our Lord thereupon ceased to believe in His parousia as 'the Son of Man' (and of course the subsequent establishment of the Kingdom), the parousia-hope would not, we may doubtless hold, have taken root in the early Christian community. It cannot be said that events moved too fast at the end to allow Him to disabuse the disciples' minds of an anticipation now baseless. Gethsemane[2] shows that at that moment He already fully understood what the situation, as regards the movement of repentance, would be on the morrow; that is to say, He was aware of the betrayal and had divined what the consequences would be for His mission. If, therefore, as we may confidently affirm, He permitted the disciples still to look for a glorious future (though only to be known by a few of His own generation),

[1] Jewish opinion about the necessity of repentanc was divided. See the evidence in Volz, *Jüd. Eschat.*, p. 112 f.

[2] See what is said about Gethsemane on pp. 149-50.

this means that His own confidence in its coming remained unshaken. Once more, nothing in the Synoptic story is more trustworthy than the representation that at the Last Supper His thoughts ran on the approaching[1] Kingdom. That circumstance acquires decisive importance for the question at issue from the trustworthiness of the tradition that our Lord was not ignorant at this juncture of what Judas had done.[2]

Of course, the Synoptics provide material for a fuller discussion of the matter than that given above. But here it is not necessary to do more than frame an opinion as to what our Lord's view was at the end of His career. It is not likely, however, that the above conclusion would be adversely affected by a further probing of the problem. In support of that opinion one might cite the parable of the seed growing secretly (Mark iv. 26–9), which clearly teaches that the Kingdom cannot be forced or hastened by human agency.[3] Man, it is true, must put the seed in the ground ; but, if that point is to be pressed, it means that he will not enter the Kingdom unless he prepares himself for it by repentance.

The inference to be drawn from the conclusion that Jesus did not consider that the coming of the Kingdom depended on repentance. The probable inference which should be drawn from the above discussion is this, that whereas before His knowledge of the betrayal by Judas our Lord counted on obtaining a mass-movement of repentance amongst His countrymen (by means of His death[4] and teaching combined), afterwards He confined the blessings of the Kingdom to a remnant.[5] Thus the betrayal was the most fateful thing in His career. He knew now that the aim of His mission, as He entertained it both in Galilee and subsequently on the

[1] See pp. 145–6 (cf. p. 157).

[2] I discuss this point on pp. 148–9.

[3] See J. Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, p. 84 f.

[4] See pp. 55–6, 156–7.

[5] Here I anticipate the conclusion that at the Last Supper Jesus Himself did not conceive His Passion to be ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. See pp. 140 f.

way to and in Jerusalem itself, would never be realized. In Galilee He had sought to procure repentance primarily by preaching, but after Galilee, owing to the crisis which developed there and its bearing on the future, He transformed His conception as to the way in which repentance would be obtained, making His Passion the really fruitful agency. But if the Passion was to have the ethical significance of evoking repentance, it was essential that the people should be convinced that He had suffered for the sake of the Kingdom of God. The mission, as our Lord thus reaffirmed it, failed through the treachery of Judas, for, on the publication of His belief about His Messianic rôle, the people forthwith rejected Him as a false Messiah and a false prophet.

Did our Lord reaffirm His mission on yet another plane after He became aware of the betrayal? Is there any good reason for believing that the conception of the mission received yet another formulation in the brief interval between the discovery of what Judas had done and the end?[1] We must look to the accounts of the Last Supper for an answer.

§ 10. *The Last Supper*

The three lines of tradition. The story is told in Mark xiv. 22–5, Matt. xxvi. 26–9, Luke xxii. 15–20, and in 1 Cor. xi. 23–6. The account of Matthew rests on Mark. That of Luke, in the oldest form of the Western text (verses 15–19a), is in disagreement with Mark (and Paul) in important respects.

[1] In this connexion I may cite Prof. B. W. Bacon: 'As prophet and teacher in Galilee he had failed. Out of defeat he snatched victory. He made the cause national by his appeal as Son of David and Son of Man in Jerusalem. Again he had failed. There was but one thing more He could do for the "reconciliation". He could dedicate His body and blood as an atonement offering for the forgiveness of sin, that God might be reconciled to His people' (*Jesus and Paul*, p. 45). I think it is a mistake to speak of 'His appeal as Son of David and Son of Man in Jerusalem'. However, it is with the last part of Prof. Bacon's verdict that I shall now be concerned.

Paul offers material which is peculiar to himself and which is drawn upon in the ordinary text of Luke. There are thus three lines of tradition relating to the institution of the rite. The fact that 1 Corinthians was written before the Synoptics need not, of course, mean that the account which we now find there is the most primitive.

Comparison of the Marcan-Matthaean and the Pauline traditions. The Marcan-Matthaean and the Pauline traditions agree in mentioning the taking of the bread, the blessing (Paul: 'giving thanks'), the breaking, and the saying, 'This is my body.' They also connect the cup with a covenant (Paul: ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη) established through the blood of our Lord. The main variations of the latter from the former tradition consist in the absence of ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς in connexion with the bread and the cup, of τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν, and of the prediction of our Lord that He would drink no more of the fruit of the vine until the Messianic Feast; the presence of the words τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (v. 24), and of τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν (in verses 24 and 25), and of the phrase μετὰ δειπνῆσαι (verse 25). There is also the variation in the words relating to the cup.[1]

Variations in the Matthaean account. A few features of the Matthaean account call for notice. The Marcan λάβετε becomes λάβετε φάγετε, the saying about the 'blood shed for many' appears with the supplement εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (also περὶ πολλῶν occurs instead of ὑπὲρ πολλῶν), and the statement 'and they all drank of it' is turned into the injunction 'drink ye all of it'.

Variations in the Lucan (Western) account. The Western text of Luke notes the cup and the bread, but reverses the order of their use as found in the other Synoptists and in Paul; moreover, whilst the words at the giving of the bread are in agreement with the Marcan, those connected with the

[1] Paul: τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.
Mark: τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.

cup are very different,[1] no statement in regard to its significance being offered. The saying about not drinking 'the fruit of the vine' goes with the cup, as in Mark and Matthew.

The question to be considered: What meaning did the rite have for our Lord Himself? Of the various interrelated problems which these accounts raise, our concern is with that which, owing to the characteristic subordination in the Gospels of historical to other interests and to the brevity of the reports, is most beset with difficulties: what significance did our Lord Himself attach to the rite?

Reasons for thinking that originally the rite had no reference to the 'many'. A question which presents itself at once is, what was the original sphere of reference of the rite? Did its range of meaning extend beyond the disciples gathered together with the Lord in the upper room? Certainty about this matter would be of great importance; but the reports in their present form are in conflict.

According to the Pauline-Lucan[2] tradition, and to that which is represented by the Western text of Luke (cf. λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς, verse 17), the reference was confined to our Lord's disciples. That is to say, the rite concerned only those who were present at the Supper. According to the Marcan-Matthaean tradition, however, the πολλοί were involved,[3] whether exclusively or in addition to the intimate disciples. The probabilities are, it seems to me, that πολλῶν at the Supper ought to be attributed to the Marcan[4] editor, who felt that the other tradition traversed the famous pronouncement that our Lord had come to give His life as a λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν (x. 45). If he had written ὑπὲρ πολλῶν

[1] Λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.

[2] 1 Cor. xi. 24 ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (Luke xxii. 19b ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον, and Luke verse 20b ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον).

[3] Mark, verse 24 ὑπὲρ πολλῶν (Matthew: περὶ πολλῶν).

[4] For additional support for this opinion see what is said about Luke xxii. 29–30a on pp. 145-6.

with full knowledge of the dire consequences for the historic mission of Judas's betrayal, the case might rest on a weaker basis. But, as may certainly be inferred from the Synoptic editors' ignorance of what Judas betrayed, it cannot be affirmed that he did.

Grounds for holding that our Lord did not die for the sake of the disciples. How are the words connected with the bread and the cup to be understood, when they are applied only to the intimate disciples? Is it historically probable that our Lord told them, in effect, 'My approaching death is ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν'? It is not easy to believe that He did. He could only have meant that by dying He would make it possible for them to enter the Kingdom. But it is entirely unlikely that our Lord invested His death with that significance; for the blessings of the Kingdom were already assured to the disciples. And further, there is no evidence elsewhere in the Synoptics which requires the interpretation that the entrance of the repentant into the Kingdom would only be possible through our Lord's death, and much which makes it abundantly clear that repentance was the one thing necessary.[1] Accordingly it would appear that our Lord Himself did not announce to the disciples that He was going to His death ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. That representation seems to be an expression of a theological conception which was formulated in the Christian community soon after the Crucifixion and according to which 'Christ died for our sins'.[2]

The words with the bread and the cup when the secondary features mentioned above are eliminated. According to Mark-Matthew, Paul, and Luke (Western text), our Lord said in connexion with the bread, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου (Paul: τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα). As regards the cup, according to Mark-Matthew He said τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης, according to Paul, τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε . . . ἀνάμνησιν, according to Luke (Western text),

[1] See p. 13 (footnote).

[2] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 3.

λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ πίω, κτλ. Thus, at the moment, the doubtful words are those in connexion with the cup.

Did our Lord say that He was making a blood-covenant? Reasons for regarding Luke xxii. 15–19 a *as not originally relevant to the question.* Leaving out of consideration for the present the command to repeat the rite, we find that the Marcan-Matthaean and the Pauline traditions represent that our Lord spoke of a blood-covenant, but that the Lucan tradition (Western) does not do so. To which of these divergent lines of testimony should priority be assigned? It seems to me that the latter is less reliable, on critical grounds, than the former.

In the first place, as is now often pointed out, Luke xxii. 15–18 looks as if it once formed a unity; if so, 19 a is a redactional accretion.[1] If it be allowed that the connexion of 19 a with verses 15–18 is artificial, it becomes possible to hold the opinion that these verses were not originally spoken on the occasion of the Last Supper, but shortly before. We know from the setting of the story that Luke, like the other Synoptic evangelists, represents that our Lord celebrated the Passover. But, as most scholars hold, the Johannine chronology of the Crucifixion is probably to be preferred to the Synoptic. If Luke wrongly assigned verses 15–18 to Passover night, it becomes, to some extent, an open question as to when the verses were originally uttered. In the verses themselves there is nothing which prevents us from assigning them to a slightly earlier meal than the Last Supper. No objection to that proposal presents itself in the saying about drinking wine no more, since, says Wellhausen, wine was not drunk at every meal. But the verses would not have been spoken before our Lord became aware that Judas had betrayed Him. For it is His knowledge of the betrayal which motived the solemn announcement that the desire which he had enter-

[1] Derived apparently from 1 Cor. xi. 24 a (Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, pp. 197 f.).

tained to eat this (coming) Passover with the disciples would not be realized.[1]

Again, bearing in mind Luke's claim that our Lord celebrated the Passover, it would be reasonable to believe that he understood that he was giving in the verses in question a summary account of what took place at the Passover-meal. That would be the natural inference to draw, especially in view of the expression τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν (verse 15). If that is what Luke understood, either he also gave a report of the Last Supper or he did not; if he did, we do not know that this was in serious conflict with the Marcan-Matthaean and the Pauline tradition; if he did not, the silence of Luke would not in itself invalidate those traditions. Thus the problem of the trustworthiness of the Marcan-Matthaean and the Pauline traditions about the words with the cup (as also of those with the bread) resolves itself into the question of their intrinsic probability.

The trustworthiness of the mention of a covenant. Let us notice first of all the allusion to a covenant.[2] The point which has to be considered is not whether our Lord claimed to be establishing a covenant, or to be renewing the old covenant, between God and Israel, but whether He spoke of a covenant between Himself and the disciples who were with Him in the upper room. If he did say that He was entering into a covenant-relationship with them, its real object is to be seen, I think, in the saying in Luke xxii. 29–30 a: 'I covenant with you (διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν) . . . that you may eat and drink at my table in my Kingdom.'[3] As in other parts of his story of the

[1] The Aramaic behind ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα would have expressed an unfulfilled desire. See Prof. R. H. Kennett, *The Last Supper*, pp. 33–4; also Prof. F. C. Burkitt and Mr. Brooke in *Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1908.

[2] The course of the critical debate on this question may be seen in M. Goguel (*L'Eucharistie*, pp. 83 ff.), who is disposed to think that 'la tradition primitive sur le dernier repas ne connaissait pas la coupe d'alliance' (p. 86).

[3] I follow H. J. Holtzmann in not regarding βασιλείαν as the object of διατίθεμαι.

Passion, Luke draws the utterance from a special source, but it would be very arbitrary to doubt its historicity. Moreover, in view of the fact that verse 28 (ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε οἱ διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου) probably implies that the public ministry was at an end, the Last Supper is an entirely suitable occasion for the saying. In 29–30 a we may therefore find a piece of direct evidence that our Lord did enter into a covenant with the disciples, and incidentally we may also find additional support for our earlier conclusion that the covenant was with them and for them and them alone.

Our Lord's purpose at the Last Supper: to make a covenant with the disciples through a sacramental rite. If our Lord made a covenant with the disciples that they might share with Him the Messianic Feast, and if, as we have urged,[1] we may not say that He held that their forgiveness (i. e. their fitness for participation in the life of the Kingdom of God) depended on His death, the references to the 'body' and to the 'blood' can be understood as giving expression to the idea of a sacramental communion. Treating the sayings, 'this is my body' and 'this is my blood of the covenant', as reliable data (it seems to me to be arbitrary[2] to reject them), we may venture to interpret our Lord's thoughts at that moment in the following way, using direct speech: 'I am convinced, as you know, that the Kingdom of God will shortly appear and that I, as the Son of Man, shall be the Ruler therein. But I also realize now that I shall not accomplish the work which I came to Jerusalem to do. My mission will fail because Judas has betrayed Me. Very soon the movement of repentance which I and you with Me have striven to spread will cease to be. Now therefore, lest the tragic crisis should prove to be

[1] p. 143.

[2] Accepting the sayings in Mark xiv. 25 and Luke xxii. 16 as primitive, M. Loisy would reject the words traditionally associated with the bread and the cup; they belong to a very different (i. e. the Pauline) current of ideas. The clue to the historic significance of the Last Supper is in Luke xxii. 15–18 (ii. pp. 538 ff.; *Les Mystères païens*, pp. 284 ff.).

too much for your trust and hope in My message of the Kingdom, I unite you to Myself, and do thereby make your place in the coming Kingdom as certain as I know My own to be.'

To attribute the above purpose to our Lord is to say that His mind was moving somewhere within that circle of ideas which underlies the Mystery religions, and primitive religion in some of its forms, and according to which, by jointly partaking of sacred food, the god and the worshippers were knit to one another. That our Lord entertained this conception in a form free from gross materialism is not at all improbable. After all, Paul endorsed this sacramental principle (cf. 1 Cor. x. 16 f.); and it is a hasty assumption which confines the explanation of that fact to the circumstances of the Gentile mission. The syncretism between the Eucharist and the ritual feasts of the Mystery-cults is more satisfactorily accounted for when it is allowed that from the beginning the sacramental idea was not absent from the Christian rite.

A comment on the command to repeat the rite. The question as to whether the Pauline-Lucan tradition is right in claiming that our Lord commanded that the rite should be repeated [1] is unimportant for our purpose. Certainly, however, the reason alleged (*εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*) is strange and difficult to accept in connexion with the making of a covenant through a rite of communion. In any case, no long time was to elapse before the reunion in the Kingdom of God.

Questions affecting a decision as to whether our Lord made a fresh affirmation of His mission just before the end of His life. Before a decision is made concerning the bearing [2] of the Supper on our Lord's last thoughts about His mission, a few

[1] Wellhausen remarks: Eine Bundschliessung geschieht ein für allemal, bedarf keiner Wiederholung und erträgt keine Wiederholung' (*Ev. Marci*, p. 118). For a summary of divergent opinions, see Goguel, *L'Eucharistie* (p. 82).

[2] I state my conclusions about this question on pp. 154–5.

other questions ought to be considered. It has been assumed without discussion that at the time of the Supper our Lord was aware that Judas had betrayed Him; also that Gethsemane was due to the consciousness of failure. It is desirable to give some justification for doing so. And how is it that at the Supper our Lord clearly contemplated dying alone? Was the flight of the disciples really so discreditable as it seems *prima facie* to have been? In addition, some consideration must be given to the not uncommon belief that our Lord identified Himself with the Suffering Servant of Jahweh in the Deutero-Isaiah.

At the time of the Last Supper Jesus was aware that Judas had betrayed him. That Judas had already entered into a pact with the hierarchy before the Last Supper is distinctly stated by all the Synoptic editors (Mark xiv. 10 f., Matt. xxvi. 14–16, Luke xxii. 3–6). Paul's phrase 'the night in which He was betrayed' (1 Cor. xi. 23) obviously refers to the actual arrest. The Synoptists also imply that some little time elapsed before our Lord was seized (Mark xiv. 11 b, Matt. xxvi. 16, Luke xxii. 6). There seems to be no reason why this testimony should be questioned. But it is not quite so easy to say that at the Supper Jesus knew of the communications with the hierarchy. However, the sources do provide us with information. They represent that all the disciples came for the Supper; and according to Mark (and Matthew) our Lord solemnly intimated, εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσε με, and according to Luke, πλὴν ἰδοὺ ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης.

The first thing to be said about the above testimony is that the future tense of the verb reflects only the editorial view of the betrayal, namely, that Judas merely informed the authorities of a suitable place and time for a secret arrest; παραδώσει, therefore, from this standpoint, points forward to the seizure which they are about to relate. Hence it is possible that the future has supplanted an original past tense which the editors, owing to their inadequate information about the betrayal, did not

understand. But whether that be so or not, we may not identify our Lord's view of the betrayal with that of the editors. The real betrayal concerned His Messianic belief. And if we allow that our Lord at the Supper announced His betrayal at the hands of one of the Twelve, and declared, in effect, that He would quickly be brought to death in consequence of it, doubtless He knew that the pledge of secrecy about the Messiahship had already been broken. How He knew what had happened we cannot say.

Consideration of an objection to an announcement of the betrayal. Against the historicity of an announcement about the betrayal only one possibly serious objection seems to present itself: did Judas participate in the rite? Our Lord would not, we may be sure, have admitted him into the covenant if he had been aware of his traitorous act. But so far as the Marcan-Matthaean evidence is concerned, nothing prevents us from supposing that Judas did not participate. Neither is it indicated when he left the supper-room, and the possibility cannot be denied that he departed before the covenant was made. The case is different in Luke; the supper was over before the betrayal was mentioned. But only a special pleader will attach any importance to the Lucan grouping of material at this point, since in one breath Luke feels able to record a woe on the betrayer (v. 22), and in the next to imply that our Lord covenanted with him that he might eat and drink with Him at the Messianic Feast and receive a throne (vv. 29, 30). The Marcan order as regards the allusion to the betrayal is certainly to be preferred.

The Agony in Gethsemane.[1] In a reference to the historical

[1] The cry of forsakenness on the Cross (Mark xv. 34, Matt. xxvii. 46) is perhaps best regarded as a renewal of the Gethsemane experience in an acuter form—that is, if it be authentic. The Lucan saying (xxiii. 46) probably represents a desire to suppress the Marcan; nevertheless, whether this citation from Ps. xxii. is to be attributed to our Lord or only to tradition remains doubtful. Difficulties attach to either hypothesis (see Montefiore,

basis of the reports, Mr. Montefiore says: 'The disciples may have seen that Jesus was wrestling in prayer; they may have perceived that He was in trepidation and sore mental distress; they may have noticed that at the moment of the arrest, before they left Him, He alone was perfectly collected and calm. Upon this knowledge, the story, as we have it now, may have been built up' (*The Synoptic Gospels*, vol. i, p. 336). But if we rightly hold that the disciples were now aware of the betrayal and that our Lord had entered into a covenant with them in view of it, we may safely ascribe to them more knowledge than that of the inwardness of the sorrow which overwhelmed His soul. Accordingly, whether or not they fell asleep, we need not (especially as there is no apparent reason for invention) call in question the substantial trustworthiness of the reports that His soul was 'very sorrowful, even unto death', and that he besought His heavenly Father to take away 'the cup' from Him and yet referred all to His will. It is natural that the slipping away of the faithless disciple should have forced on the acutest distress, for now the fateful crisis would develop swiftly, unless events were overruled from heaven. For those who hold that our Lord went to Jerusalem fully expecting to die there, the prayer for the intervention of God has usually been a stumbling-block. But the problem disappears when it is realized that the betrayal was fatal for the mission and that in Gethsemane our Lord knew that this would be so. It was the realization of the consequences (none the less real to Him because they had yet to become actual) of the betrayal which flooded His soul with grief and forced the cry to the Omnipotent: His rejection by His countrymen, ὄχλος and hierarchy alike; the guilt they would incur; and their own inevitable rejection at the coming Judgement.

A suggestion as to why the[1] *disciples fled* (Mark xiv. 50; *The Synoptic Gospels*, i, p. 371; ii, p. 1082); and accordingly I do not propose to look in this direction for additional support for the position advocated above.

[1] See pp. 104–5.

Matt. xxvi. 56). If we had more information about the inner history of the last night, it seems likely that we should find other significance in the flight of the disciples than that which lies on the surface. Doubtless they fled owing to the situation which had developed; but the dark fact about this situation was that our Lord was about to die on a wrong issue, and that, so far as the mission as He had affirmed it was concerned, His death would be in vain. That tragic circumstance would not have been withheld from intimate associates; indeed it asserts itself, as we have seen, in the stories of the Supper. But if our Lord abandoned His belief that He would evoke repentance through His Passion, the possibility arises that He at the same time desired that the disciples should, if possible, escape the fate which He had once called on them to accept. This is not to say that He now looked to them to renew the call to repentance after He Himself had gone. Israel's opportunity would pass with His death. It means, I think, no more than that the cause of the Kingdom would neither gain by their death nor lose by their safety; the Kingdom would appear without much delay; they were now free to enter into it alive. Possibly this view throws some light on the otherwise obscure saying about the swords (Luke xxii. 36 f.). Jesus may have meant: 'I know that My foes are bent on My destruction, but as they will want as little disturbance as possible, a chance exists for you; see to it that you are not taken.' Not out of harmony with this view is the admonishment (Mark xiv. 38, Matt. xxvi. 41, Luke xxii. 46) that the disciples should pray that they might not enter into trial (πειρασμός).

Jesus and the Suffering Servant of Jahweh

Did our Lord connect His Passion with the fulfilment of the rôle of the Suffering Servant of Jahweh in the Deutero-Isaiah?[1] There seems to me to be no satisfactory evidence that He did so.

Examination of relevant passages.

Matthew xi. 2–6, Luke vii. 18–23.

As has often been pointed out, Matthew (xi. 2–6) and Luke (vii. 18–23), Q presumably being their source, report a passage in which Isaiah lxi. 1 is probably alluded to. This was our Lord's reply to the inquiry of the emissaries of the Baptist as to whether He was ὁ ἐρχόμενος. The reference, however, is to the ministry of healing and to the public preaching of good news, but not to the Passion.

The λύτρον-passage. In Mark there is one instance where the matter is not so clear, viz. x.[2] 45 (= Matt. xx. 28; cf. Luke xxii. 27). It is said that διακονῆσαι recalls the expression 'servant'; that 'to give His life' alludes to 'He poured out His life unto death' (R.V. of Isaiah liii. 12); that 'for many' takes up the idea in 'my righteous servant shall justify many', and in 'he bare the sin of many' (R.V. of Isa. liii. 11, 12). But, on the other hand, the fact that the crucial word λύτρον is not applied to the Servant seems to render the parallelism much too superficial for the inference which some critics desire to draw from it. Moreover, there is the question of historicity. Luke (xxii. 27 ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ

[1] I incline to the view of those scholars who identify the 'Servant' with the nation of Israel (see, for example, the article by the late Prof. G. Buchanan Gray in Hastings's shorter *Dictionary of the Bible*, pp. 838–9). According to the lofty teaching of the Deutero-Isaiah, the heathen nations come to know and accept Jahweh through the vicarious suffering of the Servant and through their repentance at His exaltation.

[2] Καὶ γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

ὑμῶν εἰμὶ ὡς ὁ διακονῶν) has an equivalent only for the first half of the Marcan logion, and as he could hardly have been ignorant of the whole, he seems to have made a conscious suppression of the second half (καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν). This is in line with the outlook of Acts, where, although our Lord is identified with the Suffering[1] Servant, the Passion is not made the *modus operandi* of the forgiveness of sins.[2] It is clear, therefore, that the more closely the λύτρον-words are related to the rôle of the Suffering Servant, the more their historicity lies open to objection from the Lucan Gospel and Acts. On the other hand, if the passage be interpreted without regard to the Servant prophecy, it may well do justice to an utterance of our Lord[3] at any time between the Confession scene and the betrayal by Judas, but not afterwards. It would not be difficult to show that the present position of the Lucan parallel has little in its favour. On this view, taking the main idea[4] of λύτρον to be that of a price paid to secure benefits for others, especially the benefits of life or liberty, and ἀντί to signify 'for the sake[5] of', the meaning of the saying is, that by His death our Lord would do what, in the circumstances, He would not be able to do by preaching alone, namely, draw πολλοί, i. e. large numbers of His compatriots, to repentance.

Matthew viii. 17, and xii. 17 f.

In viii. 17, the Matthaean editor introduces a rendering (or a reminiscence) of Isa. liii. 4, but he applies it to the healing ministry, not to the Passion. Again, in the xii. 17 f.,

[1] Acts viii. 32 f., cf. iii. 13, 26, iv. 27, 30.

[2] Cf. Acts ii. 38, iii. 19, xvii. 30, &c.

[3] The rejection of the Messianic title (see pp. 77–8, 97 f.) affects the present form of the logion, but not its substance. For Loisy the saying is unhistorical; it embodies Pauline ideas (ii. 241 f.). Wellhausen's criticism is also adverse: there is a sudden change from the idea of service to that of a redemptive or vicarious sacrifice (*Ev. Marci*, pp. 84–5).

[4] For the meaning of λύτρον see Westcott, *Ep. to Hebrews*, pp. 295 ff.; Swete, *St. Mark*, pp. 240–1.

[5] Cf. Heb. xii. 2 ὃς ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς, κτλ.

he cites Isa. xlii. 1–4, but only to make the injunction, *ἵνα μὴ φανερὸν αὐτὸν ποιήσωσιν*, a fulfilment of prophecy.

Luke iv. 18 f., and xxii. 37.

As regards Luke, the programme of the ministry is said (iv. 18 f.) to have been unfolded at Nazareth by the use of the passage in Isa. lxi. 1 f., but here, as was said above, there is no reference to suffering and death. On the other hand, in his account of what took place in the upper room, Luke reports (xxii. 37) that our Lord applied to Himself the words, 'and he was reckoned with transgressors' (cf. Isa. liii. 12). But it is one thing to allow that this saying from the Deutero-Isaiah may have been in our Lord's mind as He foresaw the circumstances of His swiftly approaching fate; it is quite another to say that He was investing His Passion with the significance which is assigned to the suffering and death of the Servant in Isa. lii. 13–liii. 12. The saying could scarcely have borne that meaning for Luke; and if our Lord Himself had now been affirming His mission in terms of the idea of an expiatory sacrifice for the sins of His countrymen, it is highly singular, to say the least, that He did not quote another part of the chapter.

It is a common-place that the Servant chapters, in particular the so-called Ebed-Jahweh Songs, present difficult problems—the text, especially lii. 13–liii. 12; with whom 'the Servant' is to be identified; what the current interpretation is likely to have been in our Lord's day. These are questions which those who think that our Lord went to His death avowedly fulfilling the rôle of the Suffering Servant need to investigate; but they are irrelevant for those who agree, as the present writer does, with the opinion of Professor F. C. Burkitt: 'The identification, the synthesis, of the Messiah and the Suffering Servant is the result of the Crucifixion, not an anticipation of it' (*Transactions of Third Internat. Congress for Hist. of Religions*, vol. ii, p. 325).

Conclusion about the question as to whether Jesus framed

a new conception of His mission after He became aware of the betrayal by Judas. At the outset[1] of the discussion on the Last Supper it was asked whether our Lord, under the shadow of the Cross, sought to surmount the consequences of the betrayal by Judas by re-affirming His mission on yet another plane. I now venture to conclude that He did not. Throughout the very brief period between the betrayal and the Crucifixion He was face to face with the fact that His work in Jerusalem would fail still more completely than in Galilee, and that whereas in Galilee He had been able to transfer elsewhere His hopes for the triumph of His cause, now it was not in His power to do more; beyond Jerusalem He could not look. Considered from the strictly historical point of view, the Last Supper had nothing to do with the mission of Jesus, as He Himself regarded it, and may not be used for the elucidation of His conception of it. It was a rite of sacramental communion, a guarantee of the reunion of Himself and the very few who were now His own in the approaching Kingdom of God.

General Summary of Conclusions

In the first, as in the last, period of the public ministry, repentance as the means of preparation for the coming Kingdom was the aim of the mission. In prosecuting this purpose in Galilee, our Lord came into bitter conflict with the Jewish religious officials over the question of the Torah. By their insistence on the authority and importance of a particular theory of the Torah, it seemed to Him that the religious leaders 'shut the Kingdom of Heaven against men' (Matt. xxiii. 13); whilst they on their side considered that our Lord was 'undermining the Torah and the religion founded upon it'. In these circumstances, conflict was inevitable.

After they had made up their minds about our Lord, the religious leaders combined with Herod Antipas, to whom an

[1] p. 140.

eschatological movement was a source of danger; together they forced Him to leave Galilee. The inner reaction on our Lord's part to the situation which thus arose was a profound change of belief about the means whereby the mission would be accomplished, but its ultimate aim remained the same in Jerusalem as in Galilee, namely, a widespread movement of repentance. Expecting that the crisis in Galilee would be repeated in Jerusalem,[1] He came to realize that the object of His mission, as He conceived it, could not be attained apart from His death. He did not regard this fate as a necessity of dogma (as Schweitzer holds); it was a necessity arising out of the historical circumstances. He did not, it seems to me, accept the *via dolorosa* in fulfilment of the rôle of the Suffering Servant of Jahweh, nor was He led by the idea of vicarious suffering which finds expression in, for example, the prayer of Eleazar (4 Macc. vi. 27-9). He anticipated that His death would be that of a martyr, but rendered unique by the end (namely, the drawing of πολλοί to repentance and thus to inclusion in the Kingdom of God) for which He would make the surrender and by the circumstance that He regarded Himself as in essence a heavenly being ('the Son of Man'). As regards public teaching, this would still have a part to play in Jerusalem, a part of crucial importance, for only thus would the common conscience be made alive to the issue (and so be drawn to repentance, without which the Kingdom could not be possessed) on which He desired that

[1] In Galilee He did not, so far as we know, come into direct relations with Sadducees; but in their philo-Romanism and their worldly degeneracy He would have seen beforehand the seeds of hostility; and possibly He would not have doubted that the Pharisees in the Sanhedrin would have little or no difficulty in securing their co-operation. In the event, the Sadducees played a prominent part, to say the least, in the opposition to our Lord and His work in Jerusalem; and whilst it would appear that the purging of the Temple brought their hostility to a head, it need not be supposed that they set themselves against Him then for the first time. According to the passage in John xi. 47 f., Caiaphas expected the Romans to take action if the work of Jesus continued.

His death should come about. What the precise issue was on which He wanted to die (die He must, if the cause was not to be abandoned or lost) is not indicated in the sources; but it seems to be quite clear that He took steps to prevent seizure as a claimant to the throne of Israel. For the order of silence at the Confession scene was doubtless intended to be a safeguard of His cause, as well as an intimation that the Davidic Messiah was no longer to be looked for. It would appear, therefore, that He desired to die on the issue of His message about the nearness of the Kingdom and the sufficiency and yet the necessity of repentance.

As regards the Messiahship, our Lord's matured conception was moulded by the crisis in Galilee, with its clear indication that death would result from the prosecution of the mission in Jerusalem. He did not go to the city as a suffering Messiah. The doctrine that our Lord was a suffering Messiah seems to be the result of the attempt of later years to combine the fact of the Passion with the belief that He was the Messiah of prophecy. But in reality He taught the disciples that He would be revealed after the Cross as the Messiah, not of prophecy but of the apocalyptic expectation of Daniel (7), Ethiopic Enoch (37–71), and 4 Ezra (13). This belief remained until the end; it was unaffected by the disastrous turn which events took.[1]

[1] It is true that the Lucan account of the reply to the high-priest (xxii. 69) does not say that the members of the Sanhedrin would see the vindication of Him whom they were seeking to bring so low. According to this report, our Lord on this occasion set no time-limit to the Parousia, did not indeed refer to the Parousia of the Son of Man at all, but only to the coming exaltation. It is improbable, however, that Luke's silence about the Parousia invalidates the Marcan testimony (xiv. 62). It is much more likely that Luke excised the time-limit to the Parousia, and in so doing omitted all reference to the Parousia, than that the Marcan editor, at a period when some, if not all, of the members of the Sanhedrin were probably dead, put into our Lord's mouth a prophecy which had not been verified by the course of events. Possibly the Lucan omission is due to the desire not to retain a prediction which could never be fulfilled.

Towards Passover, after a long but purposeful delay, our Lord set out for Jerusalem with a handful of disciples pledged to silence about the Messiahship and informed that the cause of the Kingdom demanded their lives. First, death for all for the sake of πολλοί, then the life of the Kingdom of God, with the office of the heavenly Messiah for the Leader and thrones for the heroic followers (Matt. xix. 28 b, Luke xxii. 30 b). It is true that our Lord longed for the spiritual refreshment of Passover (Luke xxii. 15), but this He regarded as a merely personal feature of the visit. He went to Jerusalem to prosecute the mission, the place and the time being deliberately chosen because they provided the conditions of something approaching a national appeal. In Jerusalem, as in Galilee, the people were eager to hear His message. The hostility of the official world grew with His power over the people, especially after the Temple incident. And yet decisive action was delayed for want of an accusation which the people would endorse and on which the Roman procurator would authorize the death penalty. Having regard to the course which events took in Galilee, it would be hazardous, indeed unwarrantable, to suppose that this state of affairs would have persisted for very long—or that our Lord counted on its doing so—if there had been no Judas. Suddenly the Jewish authorities found themselves masters of the situation; they were able to go to the procurator and to the people with the intimation that our Lord claimed Messiahship. Judas had turned traitor. Some little time before the crisis actually took definite shape our Lord knew what Judas had done, and with the knowledge came the realization that the task which had drawn Him to Jerusalem would not be accomplished. For the people would reject Him and His message and He would die on an issue (viz. as a false Messiah and a false prophet) which, far from evoking their repentance, would load them with guilt. In the darkness of this defeat He bound the loyal disciples to Himself at the Last Supper, guaranteeing them reunion after a while;

for though few of His own generation[1] would possess it, the Kingdom would come. Here is an expectation which the course of history has left unfulfilled; but this only means that our God and Father, in His ordering of the world, kindled and sustained in the Prophet of Nazareth an enthusiasm and an utter devotion the ultimate purpose of which He Himself discerned only in part.

[1] See p. 137 (with footnote).

Vu à Strasbourg, le 30 mai 1923 :

Le président de la soutenance,

G. BALDENSPERGER.

Vu :

Le doyen de la Faculté de Théologie protestante,

EUG. EHRHARDT.

Vu et permis d'imprimer :

Le recteur d'Académie, directeur général de l'Instruction publique et des Beaux-Arts,

S. CHARLÉTY.

PRINTED IN ENGLAND
AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS